BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER OF THE:)

PERMITTING AND)

ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE)

DATE AND TIME: WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1997

9:30 A.M.

PLACE: BOARD HEARING ROOM 8800 CAL CENTER DRIVE SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, RPR, CSR CERTIFICATE NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 42616

APPEARANCES

MR. ROBERT FRAZEE, CHAIRMAN MR. STEVEN R. JONES, MEMBER MR. PAUL RELIS, MEMBER

STAFF PRESENT

MR. RALPH CHANDLER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MR. KEITH SMITH, DEPUTY DIRECTOR

MR. ELLIOT BLOCK, LEGAL COUNSEL

MS. LORI LOPEZ, COMMITTEE SECRETARY

	INDEX			
		PAGE NO.		
CALL TO OR	DER	6		
EX PARTE C	COMMUNICATIONS	6, 202		
ITEM 1: REPORT FROM THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR 7 OF THE PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION.				
FACILITY P LANDFILL, S P	CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED PERMIT FOR THE ZANKER ROAD SANTA CLARA COUNTY. CHAPTER PRESENTATION PUBLIC TESTIMONY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION ACTION			
FACILITY P STATION AN COUNTY. S P	CONSIDERATION OF A NEW SOLD CERMIT FOR THE ROBERT A. NO ID MATERIALS RECOVERY FACIO STAFF PRESENTATION CUBLIC TESTIMONY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION ACTION	ELSON TRANSFER		
FACILITY P RIVERSIDE S P C	CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED PERMIT FOR THE BLYTHE SANIT COUNTY. STAFF PRESENTATION PUBLIC TESTIMONY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION			
FACILITY P LANDFILL, S P	CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED PERMIT FOR THE EDOM LITTLE RIVERSIDE COUNTY. CHAFF PRESENTATION PUBLIC TESTIMONY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION			

ITEM 6: CONSIDERATION OF A NEW SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE MUSTANG HILL LANDFILL, KINGS COUNTY.

STAFF PRESENTATION 41

	PUBLIC TESTIMONY	42		
	COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	42		
	ACTION	43		
ITEM 7: CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR A MAJOR TIRE FACILITY PERMIT FOR CALIFORNIA ASBESTOS MONOFILL, CALAVERAS COUNTY.				
	STAFF PRESENTATION	44		
	PUBLIC TESTIMONY			
	COMMITTEE DISCUSSION			
	ACTION	51		
ITEM 8: CONSIDERATION OF THE ISSUANCE OF A NEW MAJOR WASTE TIRE FACILITY PERMIT FOR CALIFORNIA ASBESTOS MONOFILL, CALAVERAS COUNTY. STAFF PRESENTATION 45				
	PUBLIC TESTIMONY			
	COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	47		
	ACTION	51		
COUNTY DE		NARY STATUS 9 13		
ITEM 10: CONSIDERATION OF TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT AS THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY FOR THE				
CITY OF	SAN DIEGO.	F.1		
	STAFF PRESENTATION PUBLIC TESTIMONY	51 56		
	COMMITTEE DISCUSSION			
	ACTION	100		
		200		
ITEM 11: CONSIDERATION OF LEGAL AUTHORITY ISSUES AND STAFF OPTIONS RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION, DEMOLITION, AND INERT TIER REGULATIONS.				
	STAFF PRESENTATION	101		
	PUBLIC TESTIMONY	115		

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION 109, 122

ACTION 122

ITEM 12: CONSIDERATION OF LEGAL AUTHORITY ISSUES AND STAFF OPTIONS RELATING TO ORGANICS TIER

REGULATIONS.				
STAFF PRESENTATION	212			
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	234			
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	224			
ACTION	236			
ITEM 13: CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL TO NOTICE PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO PLACE	FORMALLY			
TRANSFER/PROCESSING OPERATIONS AND FAC	ILITIES			
WITHIN THE REGULATORY TIERS.				
STAFF PRESENTATION	124			
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	132			
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION 14	1, 205			
ACTION	211			
ITEM 14: STATUS OF THE WASTE TIRE	236			
STABILIZATION AND ABATEMENT PROGRAM.				
ITEM 15: OPEN DISCUSSION.				
ITEM 16: ADJOURNMENT	245			

1	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA;
2	WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 5TH, 1997
3	9:30 A.M.
4	
5	CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: MEETING WILL COME TO
6	ORDER, PLEASE. THIS IS THE NOVEMBER 5TH MEETING OF
7	THE PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE OF THE
8	INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD. SECRETARY WILL
9	CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE.
10	THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER JONES.
11	MEMBER JONES: HERE.
12	THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
13	MEMBER RELIS: HERE.
14	THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN FRAZEE.
15	CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: HERE. ALL MEMBERS ARE
16	PRESENT.
17	DO WE HAVE ANY EX PARTE
18	COMMUNICATIONS TO DISCLOSE THIS MORNING?
19	MEMBER JONES: I DO, MR. CHAIRMAN. I HAVE
20	FOUR. I SPOKE BRIEFLY WITH TERRY EGAN, SAID HELLO
21	TO GEORGE LARSON, MET WITH MR. KENNEDY FROM INYO
22	COUNTY TO SEE HOW WE WERE DOING IN INYO COUNTY, AND
23	WITH MR. DON ANDRES, WHO'S REPRESENTING EDOM HILL

ON THAT ITEM.

25 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: MR. RELIS.

```
BOARD MEMBER RELIS: JUST TERRY -- I'M
 1
       SORRY, YOUR LAST NAME -- FROM SAN DIEGO. WHERE ARE
 2
       YOU? DAVE TERRY, JUST SAID HELLO. THAT'S IT.
 3
              CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY. AND MINE ARE ALL
 5
      RECORDED.
 6
                    BY WAY OF ANNOUNCEMENTS, BEFORE WE
      BEGIN THE AGENDA, FIRST OF ALL, THE USUAL
 7
 8
      PROCEDURE. IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK ON ANY ITEM ON
 9
      TODAY'S AGENDA, THERE ARE SPEAKER SLIPS AT THE BACK
10
      TABLE. IF YOU FILL THOSE OUT AND BRING THEM
11
      FORWARD TO THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY, SO WE CAN CALL
      UPON YOU AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME.
12
                    THE -- IT'S THE INTENTION OF THE
13
14
      CHAIR TO TAKE ONE ITEM OUT OF ORDER TODAY AND THEN
      PROCEED WITH THE BALANCE OF THE AGENDA AS IT IS.
15
      FIRST, LET'S HAVE THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR'S REPORT.
16
              MS. RICE: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN AND
17
      MEMBERS. I'LL BE VERY BRIEF IN THE INTEREST OF
18
      GETTING TO TODAY'S AGENDA, WHICH IS LENGTHY. ONE
19
      BRIEF ITEM, WHICH IS A CARRY-OVER FROM LAST MONTH,
20
      IS MY REPORT TO YOU COVERING DELEGATED APPROVALS
21
```

FOR THE THIRD QUARTER OF 1997.

THE MEMO OUTLINING THE DETAIL OF ALL

22

23

- OF THOSE APPROVALS IS ON ITS WAY TO YOU TODAY. AS
- 25 SOME VERY BRIEF HIGHLIGHTS, IT DOES INCLUDE SIX

MODIFIED PERMITS, EIGHT TIRE -- 18 TIRE ENFORCEMENT 1 ORDERS, AND ONE FINAL CLOSURE PLAN APPROVAL. AS I 2 INDICATED, COPIES ARE ON THEIR WAY TO YOU WITH ALL 3 OF THE NAMES OF THE FACILITIES AND THE DETAIL. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, AFTER YOU'VE HAD TIME TO 5 6 REVIEW IT, FEEL FREE TO CALL ME AND I'LL PROVIDE 7 THAT. 8 ALSO, IF ANY MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE 9 WOULD LIKE A COPY OF THE MEMO, JUST LEAVE YOUR CARD 10 WITH ME AT SOME POINT AND I'LL MAKE SURE THAT YOU 11 GET THAT MEMO AS WELL. SECONDLY, A VERY BRIEF UPDATE ON 12 ENFORCEMENT ORDERS THAT WE ARE AWARE OF THAT HAVE 13 14 BEEN ISSUED UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHIPPING AND GRINDING REGULATIONS, THE STORAGE AND CHIPPING AND 15 16 GRINDING REGULATIONS. WE ARE AWARE OF A NUMBER OF ACTIONS 17 WITHIN RIVERSIDE COUNTY, I BELIEVE TWO ENFORCEMENT 18 LETTERS AND ONE CEASE AND DESIST ORDER, AND MY 19 UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THEY HAVE HAD AN IMPACT IN 20 TERMS OF BRINGING ABOUT A BETTER OUTCOME. 21

A CEASE AND DESIST ORDER WHICH ALSO HAS BEEN

WITHIN ORANGE COUNTY WE ARE AWARE OF

22

23

- 24 EFFECTIVE IN STOPPING THE ACTIVITY THAT WAS
- 25 OCCURRING. AT THIS TIME I DON'T HAVE REPORTS IN

- 1 FROM ALL COUNTIES AND WILL PROBABLY TRY, IN THE
- 2 INTEREST OF TIME, TO PREPARE A WRITTEN REPORT THAT
- 3 I CAN PROVIDE YOU BETWEEN NOW AND THE NEXT MEETING.
- 4 AND IN THE INTEREST OF BREVITY, THAT CONCLUDES MY
- 5 REPORT.
- 6 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY. THANK YOU.
- 7 MR. CHANDLER, DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING?
- 8 MR. CHANDLER: NOTHING THIS MORNING, MR.
- 9 CHAIRMAN. THANK YOU.
- 10 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: NOW WE'RE GOING TO TAKE
- 11 ITEM 9 OUT OF ORDER IN ORDER TO ACCOMMODATE THE
- 12 TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS. THIS IS THE CONSIDERATION OF
- PROGRESS MADE BY THE INYO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
- 14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES AS THE LOCAL
- 15 ENFORCEMENT AGENCY FOR INYO COUNTY DURING THE
- 16 SIX-MONTH PROBATIONARY STATUS. STAFF REPORT.
- 17 MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. MARY
- 18 COYLE AND GABE ABOUSHANAB OF STAFF WILL MAKE THE
- 19 PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM.
- 20 MS. COYLE: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN AND
- 21 MEMBERS. THIS ITEM IS TO UPDATE YOU ON THE STATUS
- OF THE SIX-MONTH PROBATIONARY STATUS OF INYO COUNTY
- 23 LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY BASED ON SOME EVALUATION

- 24 CONCERNS THAT WE HAD. THE COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD
- 25 IN MARCH OF THIS YEAR PLACED INYO COUNTY ON A

- 1 SIX-MONTH PROBATIONARY, SO WE'RE BACK TO REPORT ON
- 2 THAT STATUS.
- 3 IN ADDITION TO THE SIX-MONTH
- 4 PROBATIONARY, THERE WAS ALSO A CLAUSE THAT IF THEY
- 5 FAILED TO TAKE ANY ENFORCEMENT ACTION, WE, THE
- 6 BOARD, COULD ASSUME THAT ROLE. SO GABE ABOUSHANAB
- 7 WILL PROVIDE YOU WITH THE UPDATE OF WHERE THEY ARE
- 8 IN IMPLEMENTING THEIR REQUIRED ACTIONS.
- 9 MR. ABOUSHANAB: MORNING, CHAIRMAN AND
- 10 BOARD MEMBERS. I'M GABE ABOUSHANAB, AND AS MARY
- 11 MENTIONED, STAFF IS HERE BEFORE YOU AS A FOLLOW-UP
- 12 TO THE MARCH '97 COMMITTEE AND BOARD MEETINGS.
- 13 INYO COUNTY LEA PERFORMANCE DURING
- 14 ITS SIX-MONTH PROBATIONARY PERIOD IS SUMMARIZED IN
- 15 ATTACHMENT 1 OF THIS ITEM. I WOULD LIKE TO DIRECT
- YOUR ATTENTION TO ATTACHMENT 1, WHICH IS ON PAGE 6
- 17 OF THE ITEM.
- 18 BRIEFLY, THE LEA'S OUTSTANDING WORK
- 19 PLAN TASKS WERE BASED ON THE APPROVED JURISDIC-
- 20 TIONAL COMPLIANCE PROPOSAL. THEY'RE OUTLINED IN
- 21 THE FIRST COLUMN. THESE TASKS WERE DISCUSSED BACK
- 22 IN MARCH, AND THE ORIGINAL COMPLIANCE DATES ARE
- OUTLINED IN THE FIRST COLUMN. THEN SUBSEQUENT TO

- THE MARCH MEETING, THE PROBATIONARY COMPLIANCE
- 25 DATES ARE OUTLINED IN THE SECOND COLUMN. THEIR

- 1 STATUS TO DATE IS THE LAST COLUMN, AND I WILL
- 2 BRIEFLY GO OVER WHERE THEY STAND.
- FOR LONE PINE, SITE SECURITY AND SITE
- 4 ATTENDANT HAVE BEEN ACCOMPLISHED. THE LONE PINE
- 5 CEQA DOCUMENTATION IS COMPLETE.
- 6 FOR INDEPENDENCE, SITE SECURITY IS
- 7 COMPLETE. FOR INDEPENDENCE ALSO, DAILY COVER IS
- 8 COMPLETE, AND THE SITE ATTENDANT IS COMPLETE TOO.
- 9 INDEPENDENCE LITTER CONTROL IS IN PLACE AND
- 10 COMPLETE, AND THE CEQA DOCUMENTATION IS COMPLETED.
- 11 I'M HAPPY TO SAY THAT FINANCIAL ASSURANCE FOR
- 12 CLOSURE AND POSTCLOSURE MAINTENANCE WAS APPROVED IN
- 13 JUNE OF '97.
- AND SUBSEQUENT TO PREPARING THIS
- 15 ITEM, I SPOKE WITH THE LEA, AND A NUMBER OF OTHER
- 16 ACCOMPLISHMENTS ARE HERE TO REPORT. THE BERMS ON
- 17 BISHOP SITE HAVE BEEN REDUCED TO ABOUT HALF THE
- 18 SIZE. THOSE HAVE THE BRUSHES AND GREEN WASTE. THE
- 19 TIRE FENCE WORK IS UNDER WAY. LARGE AND RIM TIRES
- 20 HAVE BEEN REMOVED. THEY HAVE A NEW PERSON, AND
- 21 THEY'VE CONTRACTED WITH A TRAILER AT THE GATE TO
- 22 HAUL AWAY TIRES, SO THERE WILL BE NO MORE TIRES
- 23 ADDED TO THE EXISTING PILE. THE CHIPPING AND

- 24 GRINDING OPERATION WAS MOVED CLOSE TO THE GATE SO
- THAT COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED ON A DAILY BASIS TO

- 1 AVOID ACCUMULATING GREEN WASTE FOR CHIPPING. AND
- THE BERM METHOD OF OPERATING THE WORKING FACE IS
- 3 REVISED. NO MORE NEW BERMS TO BE CREATED, AND THE
- 4 PEOPLE THERE ARE COMPACTING AND COVERING ALL THE
- 5 TIME TO AVOID LITTER PROBLEMS.
- 6 AND OUTSIDE THIS LIST OF
- 7 ACCOMPLISHMENTS, SHOSHONE CLOSURE PLANS WERE
- 8 SUBMITTED ON TIME, WHICH WAS OCTOBER 1ST.
- 9 IN ESSENCE, THIS CONCLUDES MY
- 10 PRESENTATION OF WHAT'S ACCOMPLISHED. MOST OF THE
- 11 OUTSTANDING TASKS WERE OF THE PERMITTING NATURE,
- 12 AND ISSUES WERE UNANTICIPATED AND DISCOVERED AS THE
- 13 PROCESS WENT ALONG. THESE ARE IN SPECIFIC OUTLINE
- ON PAGE 3 OF THE ITEM UNDER -- I'M SORRY -- IT'S
- UNDER PAGE 4 OF THE ITEM UNDER KEY ISSUES IF YOU
- 16 WANT TO KNOW THE PARTICULAR OUTSTANDING ITEMS FOR
- 17 THE PERMIT RELATED ISSUES.
- 18 I WILL TURN IT OVER TO MARY TO GO
- 19 OVER THE NEXT ITEM, WHICH IS, I BELIEVE, RECOMMEN-
- 20 DATION FOR STAFF UNLESS YOU HAVE QUESTIONS.
- 21 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: QUESTIONS?
- 22 MEMBER JONES: I'LL WAIT TILL I HEAR THE
- 23 RECOMMENDATIONS.

MS. COYLE: INCLUDED IN THE AGENDA ITEM ON
25 PAGES 2 AND 3 ARE THE OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE

- 1 COMMITTEE AND BOARD. BASED ON THE STATUS AND ALL
- 2 THE ACTIVITIES THAT HAVE BEEN DONE IN INYO COUNTY
- 3 BY THE LEA, WE ARE -- STAFF IS RECOMMENDING THAT
- 4 THEY BE CONTINUED ON A SIX-MONTH PROBATIONARY LEA
- 5 STATUS UNTIL APRIL OF '98 SO THAT WE CAN CONTINUE
- 6 OUR OVERSIGHT AS TO THEIR PROGRESS AND COME BACK
- 7 AND REPORT TO THE BOARD AT THAT TIME.
- 8 OUR RESOLUTION THAT WE'RE
- 9 RECOMMENDING ALSO INCLUDES A STATEMENT THAT IF AT
- 10 ANY TIME THE LEA FAILS TO TAKE APPROPRIATE
- 11 ENFORCEMENT ACTION, THE BOARD HAS THE OPTION TO
- 12 STEP IN AND ASSUME THAT ROLE IF WE FEEL IT'S
- 13 NECESSARY. THEREFORE, WE RECOMMEND THE BOARD ADOPT
- 14 RESOLUTION 97-507.
- 15 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AND THE LEA IS PRESENT.
- MR. KENNEDY, DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS?
- 17 MR. KENNEDY: I WOULD JUST LIKE TO ADD,
- AND IT'S PROBABLY SIMILAR TO WHAT I SAID LAST
- 19 SPRING, IS WORKING WITH YOUR STAFF AND WORKING WITH
- THIS PROCESS, IT WAS PROBABLY MY IMPRESSION FOR
- 21 MANY, MANY YEARS IN RURAL INYO COUNTY THAT IT WOULD
- 22 BE VERY DIFFICULT TO EVER HAVE A PERMIT AND
- 23 COMPLIANT LANDFILL THROUGHOUT OUR AREA.

24 I THINK THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD HAS 25 WORKED QUITE WELL. IT'S GONE BEYOND THE SCOPE OF

13

- 1 THE LEA IN INYO COUNTY. THE PROBATION STATUS HAS 2 BEEN RECOGNIZED ON THE COUNTY THROUGH THE PRESS.
- 3 AND THE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, I TOLD THEM
- 4 YESTERDAY THIS IS THE FIRST BOARD IN 15 YEARS THAT
- 5 I'VE BEEN THERE THAT HAS REALLY BIT THE BULLET AND
- 6 SAID LET'S DEAL WITH THIS SOLID WASTE ISSUE AND
- 7 LET'S MOVE TOWARDS COMPLIANCE.
- 8 AND I THINK, AS YOU CAN SEE, THE
- 9 MAJORITY OF THE ITEMS ARE MOVING ALONG. I THINK
- 10 WE'RE OVER THE TOP OF THE HILL NOW, STARTING TO
- 11 COME DOWN THE BACK SIDE, AND I'M VERY HOPEFUL AND
- 12 OPTIMISTIC FOR ONCE THAT MAYBE BY NEXT SUMMER
- 13 THINGS WILL BE LOOKING VERY CLOSE TO BEING
- 14 COMPLETED.
- 15 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY.
- 16 MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WENT TO
- 17 INYO COUNTY AT THE REQUEST OF MR. KENNEDY AND WAS
- 18 PRETTY SURPRISED WHEN TWO SUPERVISORS AND THE PRESS
- 19 AND THE ENTIRE STAFF SHOWED UP FOR OUR EVENT THAT I
- 20 THOUGHT WAS JUST GOING TO BE A TOUR. THEY HAVE, I
- 21 THINK, BITTEN THE BULLET, AND I'M MORE AWARE OF THE
- 22 ISSUES. THEY KIND OF PUT ME -- I THINK MR. KENNEDY
- 23 KIND OF PUT ME ON THE SPOT BECAUSE HE ASKED FOR

- 24 SOME OPERATIONAL TIPS ABOUT HOW SOME THINGS MIGHT
- BE DONE DIFFERENTLY.

```
AND THE BERMS ARE -- I MEAN THE
 1
       THINGS THAT THEY'VE DONE MAKE IT A BETTER FACILITY.
 2
       I NOTICE THAT WE'RE NOT IN COMPLIANCE ON LONE PINE
 3
       ON LITTER CONTROL AND DAILY COVER; AND WHILE IT'S
       PROBABLY NOT MY -- PROBABLY NOT NORMAL FOR ME TO
 5
 6
       ASK THIS QUESTION, BUT HAS AL BEEN MOVED TO LONE
       PINE?
 7
 8
              MR. KENNEDY: I WAS CURIOUS IF THIS ISSUE
 9
       CAME UP AND HOW I WOULD RESPOND. BUT, YES, HE
10
       HAS.
11
               MEMBER JONES: BECAUSE I WOULD SUGGEST
       THAT THE LEA HAS DONE A GOOD JOB OF -- I THINK WE
12
       KNEW WHEN WE PUT THIS LEA ON PROBATION THAT THE LEA
13
14
       WAS, IN FACT, DOING HIS JOB, THAT IT WAS FINANCIAL
       RESTRAINTS AND MAYBE NOT THE WILL OF THE
15
       SUPERVISORS TO REALLY FOLLOW THROUGH ON WHAT THOSE
16
       ORDERS WERE. AND I THINK YOU'VE DONE A GREAT JOB,
17
       AND I THINK YOUR SUPERVISORS HAVE DONE A GREAT JOB
18
       IN ATTACKING THAT BULLET.
19
                     I DO THINK THAT THE COVER ISSUE AND
20
       THE LITTER ISSUE IS AN OPERATIONAL ISSUE, AND IT
21
       IS -- FOR ANYBODY THAT HAS WORKED IN RURAL
22
```

CALIFORNIA, WHEN YOU HAVE SOMEBODY THAT HAS BEEN ON

23

- THE LANDFILL FOR 25 YEARS, THEY DO IT THEIR WAY AND
- NOBODY ELSE KNOWS ANYTHING. AND DON ANDREWS IS

- 1 SITTING THERE LAUGHING. THEY -- SO IT'S GOING TO
- 2 TAKE TIME, BUT I THINK THAT I'M BRINGING THIS
- 3 FORWARD SO THAT YOU CAN BRING IT BACK TO INYO
- 4 COUNTY, THAT, YOU KNOW, WE NEED TO CHANGE THE
- 5 ATTITUDE ON THE PART OF THAT ONE INDIVIDUAL THAT
- 6 THIS STUFF HAS TO BE DONE. BUT, YOU KNOW, I'M VERY
- 7 PLEASED WITH WHAT YOU DID. I APPRECIATED THE
- 8 OPPORTUNITY.
- 9 I KNOW MR. RELIS ALSO SPENT TIME IN
- 10 INYO COUNTY, AND IT WAS PRETTY ENLIGHTENING WHEN
- 11 YOU GET THERE AND YOU SEE THE ISSUES THAT YOU HAVE
- 12 TO DEAL WITH. BUT I THINK YOU GUYS HAVE DONE A
- 13 GOOD JOB AND, YOU KNOW, TALK TO AL. SLAP HIM A
- 14 LITTLE BIT.
- 15 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY. WE HAVE THE
- 16 RESOLUTION BEFORE US.
- 17 MEMBER RELIS: WELL, I WAS JUST GOING TO
- 18 MAKE A FEW ANECDOTAL COMMENTS OUTSIDE THE FORMAL
- 19 ACTION BECAUSE WHILE I WAS OUT THERE, WE HAD A
- 20 CHANCE TO DISCUSS THE PROBLEM WITH THE TIRE
- 21 VIOLATION AND WHAT COULD BE DONE ABOUT IT.
- 22 AND I WAS GRATIFIED TO HEAR YESTERDAY
- 23 IN THE BRIEFING THAT IT LOOKS LIKE WE MAY HAVE THE

- 24 POSSIBILITY OF UNDERTAKING A LOAN RELATIONSHIP WITH
- 25 INYO COUNTY TO REMEDIATE THE TIRE PROBLEM IN ONE

- 1 FELL SWOOP AND THEN ALSO A PLEDGE OF A REPAYMENT,
- 2 WHICH WOULD BE A PRECEDENT, I THINK, A GOOD
- 3 PRECEDENT IN THIS CASE.
- 4 I WAS STRUCK IN MY TIME OUT THERE
- 5 JUST WHAT KINDS OF PROBLEMS. YOU ARE 300 MILES OR
- 6 250 MILES AWAY FROM THE POPULATION CENTERS, AND
- 7 INYO COUNTY IS ABOUT AS REMOTE IN THAT RESPECT AS
- 8 ANYPLACE IN CALIFORNIA.
- 9 I THINK THEY ARE STRUGGLING BECAUSE
- 10 THEY HAVE A VERY LARGE POPULATION INFLUX. IT'S A
- 11 TRANSIENT POPULATION ON THE WAY TO DESTINATIONS AND
- 12 STOPPING OFF, SO THEY HAVE THE IMPACTS OF A MUCH
- 13 LARGER POPULATION, BUT ALL THE BURDENS OF BEING
- 14 RURAL. SO I HAVE SOME SYMPATHY FOR THEIR PLIGHT,
- 15 AND I THINK WE SHOULD DO ALL WE CAN WITH OUR
- MONIES, IN THIS CASE OUR TIRE MONEY, TO HELP THEM.
- 17 AND IT'S GRATIFYING TO SEE, LIKE WITH
- MR. JONES, SEVERAL OF THE SUPERVISORS OUT AND
- 19 INDICATING THEIR COMMITMENT TO BOTH MORE COMPLETELY
- 20 FINANCING A SOLID WASTE SYSTEM AND THE WILLINGNESS,
- 21 MOST IMPORTANTLY, I THINK, TO THIS BOARD, TO
- 22 PARTNER WITH THE BOARD ON A REPAYMENT SCHEDULE TO
- 23 SOLVE A MAJOR PROBLEM. SO I WISH THEM WELL.

24 AND I'M HAPPY TO MOVE THIS ITEM,
25 RECOMMEND THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION IF THAT'S IN

```
1 ORDER.
```

- CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: YES, UH-HUH. WE HAVE A
- 3 MOTION ON THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 97-507.
- 4 MEMBER JONES: I'LL SECOND. THAT'S OPTION
- 5 6 AND 7.
- 6 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: SECRETARY WILL CALL THE
- 7 ROLL ON THAT, PLEASE.
- 8 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- 9 MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- 10 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER JONES.
- MEMBER JONES: AYE.
- 12 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN FRAZEE.
- 13 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AYE. MOTION IS
- 14 CARRIED. IF THERE'S NO OBJECTION, WE'LL RECOMMEND
- 15 THIS FOR CONSENT TO THE FULL BOARD.
- OKAY. THANK YOU.
- NOW WE'RE READY TO MOVE TO ITEM 2,
- 18 WHICH IS THE CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE
- 19 FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE ZANKER ROAD CLASS III
- 20 LANDFILL IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY.
- MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND
- 22 MEMBERS. JON WHITEHILL WILL MAKE THE STAFF
- 23 PRESENTATION, ASSISTED BY DENNIS FERRIER WITH THE

- 24 LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.
- MR. WHITEHILL: GOOD MORNING, MR.

18

CHAIRMAN, AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. THE LANDFILL IS 1 LOCATED -- ZANKER ROAD LANDFILL IS LOCATED NEAR THE 2 INTERSECTION OF LOS ESTEROS ROAD AND ZANKER ROAD IN 3 THE CITY OF SAN JOSE. SURROUNDING LAND USE INCLUDES THE SAN JOSE/SANTA CLARA WATER POLLUTION 5 6 CONTROL PLANT AND SLUDGE DRYING PONDS TO THE EAST, SALT EVAPORATOR PONDS TO THE NORTH AND NORTHWEST, 7 OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLASS WASTE DISPOSAL SITE TO THE 8 9 WEST, THE INACTIVE NINE-PAR DISPOSAL SITE, WHICH IS NOW DESIGNATED AS WETLANDS, AND THE COMMUNITY OF 10 ALVISO APPROXIMATELY ONE MILE TO THE WEST. 11 THE PERMIT BEFORE YOU IS BEING 12 REVISED TO REFLECT CHANGES IN FACILITY OPERATION 13 14 AND MORE SPECIFICALLY CONDITIONED SITE DESIGN PARAMETERS. FOR INSTANCE, THE 1985 PERMIT ALLOWED 15 THE LANDFILL TO ACCEPT AN AVERAGE OF 350 TONS OF 16 WASTE PER DAY AND ENCOURAGED RECOVERY OF RECYCLABLE 17 18 MATERIALS. THE PROPOSED PERMIT ALLOWS THE 19 FACILITY TO RECEIVE A MAXIMUM OF 1300 TONS OF 20 MATERIAL PER DAY, COMPOST 200 TONS OF GREEN 21 MATERIAL PER DAY, AND DISPOSE OF 300 TONS OF WASTE 22

PER DAY.

23

24			ADI	DITIONA	AL CH	HANGES	THAT	ARE	PROPOSED
25	OR	HAVE	OCCURRED	SINCE	THE	SOLID	WASTE	FAC	CILITY

PERMIT WAS ISSUED IN 1985 INCLUDE AN INCREASE IN 1 THE PERMITTED FILL AREA, THE NAME OF THE OWNER AND 2 OPERATOR HAVE CHANGED, THE ESTIMATED CLOSURE DATE 3 HAS CHANGED FROM 1992 TO 2003. AS I MENTIONED, THE PERMITTED TONNAGE HAS CHANGED. THE PROPOSED PERMIT 5 6 WILL ALSO MORE SPECIFICALLY CONDITION THE STORAGE AND PROCESSING OF RECYCLABLE MATERIALS AND RESOURCE 7 RECOVERY ACTIVITIES AT THE LANDFILL SUCH AS 8 9 CONCRETE AND ASPHALT GRINDING, WOODWASTE CHIPPING AND GRINDING, GREEN MATERIAL COMPOSTING, SOIL 10 11 REMEDIATION, AND CARDBOARD, WALLBOARD, AND METALS RECYCLING. 12 THIS FACILITY IS EXPECTED TO RECOVER 13 14 BETWEEN 50 AND 90 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL MATERIAL RECEIVED. ALSO, THERE WILL BE A NEW WASTE TIRE 15 STORAGE AREA, AND THE HOURS OF OPERATION WILL 16 CHANGE. 17 AT THE TIME THE COMMITTEE ITEM WAS 18 PREPARED, BOARD STAFF HAD NOT YET RECEIVED THE 19 PROPOSED PERMIT OR MADE ALL THE REQUIRED FINDINGS 20 FOR CONCURRENCE. BOARD STAFF HAVE SINCE BEEN ABLE 21 22 TO MAKE ALL THE REQUIRED FINDINGS EXCEPT FOR THE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN CONFORMANCE 23

24 FINDING.

25 IN ADDITION, THE LEA HAS MADE SOME

1

PERMITTED COMPOSTING AREA. AND SOME REGULATORY 2 CITATIONS HAVE CHANGED, AND THE LEA WILL EXPLAIN 3 THAT AT THE END OF MY PRESENTATION. THE LEA AND BOARD STAFF HAVE MADE THE 5 FOLLOWING FINDINGS, THAT THE LEAD AGENCY AND 6 OPERATOR HAVE COMPLIED WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE 7 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, THE PROPOSED 8 9 PERMIT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE STANDARDS ADOPTED BY 10 THE BOARD, THE OPERATION OF THE FACILITY IS 11 CONSISTENT WITH THE APPROVED COUNTY INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN. 12 BOARD AND LEA STAFF HAVE DOCUMENTED 13 14 THAT THE DESIGN AND OPERATION IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH STATE MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR SOLID WASTE HANDLING 15 AND DISPOSAL, AND THE OPERATOR AND THE LEA HAVE 16 FOUND THAT THE OPERATION OF THIS FACILITY IS 17 CONSISTENT WITH THE APPROVED COUNTY INTEGRATED 18 WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN. AND THE BOARD'S OFFICE OF 19 LOCAL ASSISTANCE WILL CONFIRM THIS FINDING PRIOR TO 20 THE BOARD MEETING. 21 IN CONCLUSION, STAFF HAS REVIEWED THE 22 PROPOSED PERMIT AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION AND 23

CHANGES TO THE PERMIT, INCLUDING A CHANGE IN THE

- FOUND THEM TO BE ACCEPTABLE, SET FORTH IN THE WASTE
- 25 MANAGEMENT PLAN WHICH WE'RE WAITING ON. IF STAFF

- 1 CONFIRM THE WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN CONFORMANCE,
- 2 STAFF WILL RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD ADOPT
- 3 RESOLUTION NO. 97-500, CONCURRING IN THE ISSUANCE
- 4 OF SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT NO. 43-AN-0003, AND
- 5 THE RESOLUTION WILL BE AVAILABLE AT THE BOARD
- 6 MEETING WHEN WE HAVE A RECOMMENDATION.
- 7 DENNIS FERRIER IS ON MY LEFT
- 8 REPRESENTING THE LEA'S OFFICE. AND ALSO THERE ARE
- 9 REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OPERATOR IF YOU HAVE ANY
- 10 QUESTIONS.
- 11 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: WISH TO MAKE A
- 12 STATEMENT?
- MR. FERRIER: THE CHANGES THAT WE MADE IN
- 14 THE PERMIT WERE A RESULT OF SOME ERRORS. SOME
- 15 CITATIONS THAT WERE PREVIOUSLY MADE FOR TITLE 14
- 16 SECTIONS ACTUALLY CHANGED AND WERE TITLE 27
- 17 SECTIONS. THEY WERE DEFINITIONAL CHANGES. THOSE
- 18 WERE CORRECTED IN THE COPY THAT WE SENT LAST WEEK
- 19 FOR THE BOARD.
- 20 THE OTHER CHANGE WAS AN ERROR. WE
- 21 HAD CITED -- WE HAD CITED ON THE KEY DESIGN
- 22 PARAMETERS THAT THE COMPOSTING AREA WAS 12 ACRES.
- 23 IT'S ACTUALLY 6 ACRES. THEY HAD NOTED IN THEIR

- 24 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT THAT THEY WOULD IN THE
- 25 FUTURE POSSIBLY BE EXPANDING TO ANOTHER 6 ACRES.

BUT THERE WAS A PROVISION THAT ADDITIONAL 1 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW WOULD BE NECESSARY IF THEY 2 WERE TO EXPAND TO AN ADDITIONAL 6 ACRES. SO WE 3 CHANGED THAT TO THE 6 ACRES THAT ARE CURRENTLY SUPPORTED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT, AND THOSE 5 WERE THE ONLY CHANGES, I BELIEVE, THAT CAME ABOUT. 6 THE OPERATOR OVER THE LAST FIVE YEARS 7 HAS MADE A CONCERTED EFFORT TO MAKE COMMITMENT AND 8 9 TIME AND CERTAINLY MONEY AND ENGINEERING RESOURCES TO DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE, ACCURATE PLAN FOR THE 10 SITE. THE RDSI IS PROBABLY, IN MY EXPERIENCE, ONE 11 OF THE MOST COMPLETE AND ACCURATE DOCUMENTS I'VE 12 EVER REVIEWED FOR A LANDFILL OPERATION. YOU CAN 13 LITERALLY PICK IT UP AND TELL EXACTLY WHAT'S GOING 14 ON AT THE SITE, AND THEY DO HAVE PLANS THAT OUTLINE 15 THE OPERATION OF THE SITE OUT THROUGH AT LEAST 16 EIGHT YEARS. 17 AND I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT 18 PURSUANT TO THE EARTHQUAKE IN 1989, THEY HAD 19 RECEIVED A LOT OF THE DEMOLITION DEBRIS FROM THAT 20 CATASTROPHE, AND THEY RECYCLED VIRTUALLY 90 PERCENT 21 OF THE MATERIAL THAT GOES THROUGH THEIR GATES. THE 22 PERMIT ALLOWS THEM TO DISPOSE OF 300 TONS A DAY,

23

- BUT IT'S VERY SELDOM WHERE THEY GO ABOVE A HUNDRED
- TONS A DAY. THE REST OF THE MATERIAL IS GROUND UP,

- 1 REPROCESSED. AND THEY'RE PROBABLY UNIQUE IN THE
- 2 FACILITIES IN CALIFORNIA IN THAT THEY FIND MARKETS
- 3 FOR VIRTUALLY EVERYTHING DOWN TO SHEETROCK AND
- 4 OTHER MATERIALS.
- 5 SO WE'RE VERY HAPPY TO BRING THIS
- 6 PERMIT UP HERE TODAY AND GET THEM CAUGHT UP. THERE
- 7 WERE CHANGES IN OPERATORS IN THE PAST. THEY HAD
- 8 SOME ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW WORK THAT WAS
- 9 DONE IN 1990 AND 1991 THAT UPDATED THE ABILITY TO
- 10 DO RECYCLING AND COMPOSTING AT THE SITE. AND THAT
- 11 TOGETHER WITH BASICALLY A 12-INCH DOCUMENT FOR
- 12 THEIR RDSI HAS COMPLETED THIS EFFORT, AND I WANTED
- 13 TO THANK BOTH THE OPERATOR AND GRACE ENVIRONMENTAL
- 14 FOR ALL THE HARD WORK AND COMMITMENT THAT WENT INTO
- 15 DOING THIS. IT WAS A BIG JOB.
- 16 THEY HAD TO BASICALLY TAKE OVER AN
- 17 OPERATION AND REPROCESS AND MOVE A LOT OF MATERIAL
- 18 FROM THE EARTHQUAKE THAT HAD BEEN STORED THERE.
- 19 AND TODAY THEIR SITE IS IN COMPLIANCE, AND WE'VE
- 20 GOT AN OPERATION THAT'S REALLY AN ASSET IN
- 21 RECYCLING IN THE BAY AREA.
- 22 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY.
- 23 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I WOULD ECHO

- 24 THAT. I THINK ZANKER, I FOLLOWED THIS FACILITY
- OVER THE YEARS. I THINK IT'S A PIONEERING FACILITY

- 1 REALLY IN THE STATE AND SEEMS TO HAVE EVOLVED ALONG
- 2 WITH THE NEEDS. THE FACT THAT IT CAN HANDLE
- 3 CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION DEBRIS AS WELL AS
- 4 ORGANICS IN A CONFINED, URBANIZED LOCATION IS, I
- 5 THINK, OF CRITICAL IMPORTANCE TO THE STATE AND THAT
- 6 PORTION OF THE STATE IN REACHING OUR 939
- 7 OBJECTIVES. SO I WHOLEHEARTEDLY SUPPORT THIS
- 8 PERMIT.
- 9 MEMBER JONES: I ECHO WHAT MR. RELIS SAYS.
- 10 THAT WAS -- THROUGH ONE OF THOSE OWNERSHIP CHANGES,
- 11 THAT WAS ONE OF OUR COMPANIES. ACTUALLY WE WERE
- 12 THE ONES DELIVERING THE WASTE TO THAT LANDFILL
- DURING THE EARTHQUAKE. AND I THINK DAN RATHER
- 14 CALLED US THE RESCUERS OF THE MEMORIES BECAUSE OF
- 15 THE EFFORTS THAT WERE PUT IN BY THE PEOPLE AT
- 16 ZANKER ROAD.
- 17 IF -- I MEAN ALL WE'RE WAITING FOR IS
- 18 THE CIWMP?
- MR. DIER: MR. JONES, YES, THAT'S ALL
- 20 WE'RE WAITING FOR IS FROM OFFICE OF LOCAL
- 21 ASSISTANCE TO VERIFY THE CIWMP CONFORMANCE. SO
- 22 STAFF WOULD RECOMMEND THAT THIS BE PLACED ON
- 23 CONSENT. AND IF THERE IS ANY ISSUE WITH THAT, WE

- 24 WOULD CERTAINLY ASK THAT THE BOARD BRING IT OFF
- 25 CONSENT IN A COUPLE OF WEEKS.

```
CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: WE CAN DO IT THAT WAY, I
 1
   GUESS. CAN WE?
 2
       MEMBER RELIS: CONDITIONAL CONSENT.
 3
             MS. TOBIAS: I GUESS MY PREFERENCE WOULD
 5
     BE --
 6
             CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: WE MOVE IT TO THE BOARD
 7
      WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION. THAT WAS GOING TO BE MY
 8 SUGGESTION.
             MEMBER JONES: OKAY. THEN I WILL MOVE
 9
10 THAT THIS PERMIT -- I WANT TO MOVE THAT THIS PERMIT
11
     BE APPROVED AND CONDITIONAL THAT IT CONFORMS WITH
    THE CIWMP.
12
13
             MEMBER RELIS: SECOND THAT.
14
             CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY. WE HAVE A MOTION
15 AND SECOND THAT THIS PERMIT BE CONDITIONALLY
16 APPROVED AND FORWARDED TO THE BOARD FOR FINAL
17 CONSIDERATION. THE SECRETARY WILL CALL THE ROLL ON
     THAT, PLEASE.
18
             THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
19
             MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
20
            THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER JONES.
21
    MEMBER JONES: AYE.
22
```

THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN FRAZEE.

24 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AYE. MOTION IS

25 CARRIED.

```
NOW WE'RE READY FOR ITEM 3, THE
 1
      CONSIDERATION OF A NEW SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT
 2
      FOR THE ROBERT A. NELSON TRANSFER STATION AND
 3
      MATERIAL RECOVERY FACILITY IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY.
      STAFF REPORT, PLEASE.
 5
               MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. DAVE
 6
      OTSUBO WILL MAKE THE STAFF REPORT ASSISTED BY
 7
      LAURIE HOLK WITH THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY FOR
 8
 9
      RIVERSIDE COUNTY.
              MR. OTSUBO: HI. GOOD MORNING, MR. FRAZEE
10
11
      AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. ITEM 3 REGARDS
      CONSIDERATION OF THE ISSUANCE OF A NEW SOLID WASTE
12
      FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE ROBERT A. NELSON TRANSFER
13
14
      STATION AND MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY. THIS SITE
      IS LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY
15
      NEAR THE CITY OF RIVERSIDE. THE FACILITY WILL BE
16
      LOCATED -- WOULD BE LOCATED ON 12.5 ACRES AND
17
      ACCEPT UP TO 2700 TONS PER DAY OF SOLID WASTE.
18
                    THE OPERATOR IS BURRTEC WASTE
19
       INDUSTRIES, AND THE FACILITY IS LOCATED WITHIN AN
20
      RMDZ.
21
22
                   AT THE TIME THAT THE COMMITTEE ITEM
```

WAS WRITTEN, STAFF HAD YET TO CONFIRM THE LEA'S

23

- 24 FINDINGS OF CONFORMANCE WITH THE COUNTY SOLID WASTE
- 25 MANAGEMENT PLAN, CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN,

- 1 AND HAD NOT DETERMINED THE ADEQUACY OF CEQA
- 2 DOCUMENTATION.
- THESE FINDINGS HAVE SINCE BEEN MADE,
- 4 AND, THEREFORE, STAFF RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD
- 5 ADOPT RESOLUTION 97-501, CONCURRING IN THE ISSUANCE
- 6 OF SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT 33-AA-0258. AND I
- 7 ASSUME THE RESOLUTIONS HAVE BEEN PASSED OUT TO YOU.
- 8 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: YES, WE DO HAVE THEM.
- 9 MR. OTSUBO: AND THIS CONCLUDES STAFF'S
- 10 PRESENTATION.
- 11 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: LEA HAVE ANY COMMENTS?
- MS. HOLK: YES. THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN
- 13 FRAZEE. LAURIE HOLK, RIVERSIDE COUNTY LEA.
- 14 THIS FACILITY, ALONG WITH THE MORENO
- 15 VALLEY FACILITY, WILL THEN COVER THE WEST END OF
- 16 RIVERSIDE COUNTY AS FAR AS TRANSFER STATION GOES.
- 17 AND THERE IS A POSSIBILITY THAT THIS TRANSFER
- 18 FACILITY WILL ALSO BE ABLE TO SERVE AS AN ABAP OR A
- 19 SITE FOR HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAM ALSO.
- 20 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY. WE HAVE A REQUEST
- 21 FROM ROBERT A. NELSON TO SPEAK ON THIS ITEM.
- 22 MEMBER RELIS: HOPEFULLY HE'S NOT GOING TO
- 23 WITHDRAW HIS NAME.

MR. NELSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE

BOARD, BOB NELSON HERE. I JUST WANT TO SPEAK IN

28

- 1 SUPPORT OF THE PERMIT FOR THE PROJECT. THIS DOES
- 2 SERVE THE CITY OF RIVERSIDE POPULATION, IMPORTANT
- 3 ELEMENT OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE WASTE HANDLING
- 4 SYSTEM IN THE WESTERN PART OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY, SO
- 5 WE WOULD URGE YOUR SUPPORT.
- 6 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: QUESTIONS OR DISCUSSION?
- 7 MEMBER RELIS: I'LL MOVE CONCURRENCE.
- 8 MEMBER JONES: I'LL SECOND.
- 9 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: WE HAVE A MOTION AND A
- 10 SECOND ON THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 97-501.
- 11 SECRETARY WILL CALL THE ROLL ON THAT, PLEASE.
- 12 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- 14 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER JONES.
- 15 MEMBER JONES: AYE.
- THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN FRAZEE.
- 17 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AYE. MOTION IS
- 18 CARRIED. AND WITHOUT OBJECTION, WE'LL RECOMMEND
- 19 CONSENT ON THAT ITEM.
- NOW, ITEM 4, WHICH IS THE CONSIDERA-
- 21 TION OF THE ISSUANCE OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE
- 22 FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE BLYTHE SANITARY LANDFILL IN
- 23 RIVERSIDE COUNTY.

24 MR. OTSUBO: HI AGAIN. I'M DAVID OTSUBO
25 WITH THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTIONS BRANCH. ITEM 4

29

REGARDS CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE 1 FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE BLYTHE SANITARY LANDFILL. 2 THIS FACILITY IS LOCATED SIX MILES 3 NORTH OF THE CITY OF BLYTHE, IS ACTIVE AND OPERATING UNDER ITS ORIGINAL PERMIT ISSUED IN 5 6 1979. THIS FACILITY IS CURRENTLY ON THE SIGNIFICANT CHANGE LIST; AND IF A NEW PERMIT IS 7 ISSUED, THIS WOULD REMOVE THE SITE FROM THIS LIST. 8 9 THE PROPOSED PERMIT WOULD ESTABLISH A 335-ACRE SITE, 78 FOR LANDFILLING. THE MAXIMUM 10 11 ELEVATION WOULD BE 525 FEET AND ESTIMATED CLOSURE OF 2034 AND WOULD INCREASE THE PERMITTED TONNAGE 12 FROM 55 TONS PER DAY TO A MAXIMUM OF 400 TONS PER 13 14 DAY. THE SITE IS OWNED AND OPERATED BY THE WASTE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DISTRICT. 15 AT THE TIME THAT BOTH THE COMMITTEE 16 AND BOARD ITEMS WERE WRITTEN, STAFF HAD NOT YET HAD 17 AN OPPORTUNITY TO VERIFY THE LEA'S FINDINGS OF 18 CONFORMANCE WITH THE COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT 19 PLAN, CONSISTENCY WITH THE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN, TO 20 CONDUCT A JOINT INSPECTION WITH THE LEA, OR VERIFY 21 22 THAT FINANCIAL ASSURANCE DOCUMENTATION WAS IN ORDER.

23

24			IN	THE	INTER	IM S	STAFF	HAVE	CONDUCTED
25	AN	INSPECTION	WIT	н тн	IE LEA	THA	AT THE	E DID	NOT
					30				

- 1 IDENTIFY ANY VIOLATIONS OF STATE MINIMUM STANDARDS,
- 2 HAVE VERIFIED THE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND
- 3 GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS OF THE LEA, AND HAVE
- 4 DETERMINED THAT THE FUNDING FOR CLOSURE-POSTCLOSURE
- 5 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATING LIABILITY ARE IN ORDER.
- 6 THEREFORE, STAFF RECOMMEND THAT THE
- 7 BOARD ADOPT RESOLUTION 97-502, CONCURRING IN THE
- 8 ISSUANCE OF SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT
- 9 33-AA-0017. AND THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION.
- 10 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY.
- MS. HOLK: NOTHING.
- 12 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: MR. NELSON, THIS ONE.
- MR. NELSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE
- BOARD, AGAIN BOB NELSON, GENERAL MANAGER FOR THE
- 15 RIVERSIDE COUNTY WASTE DISTRICT.
- 16 THIS IS THE LAST LANDFILL IN OUR
- 17 SYSTEM OF ABOUT A DOZEN LANDFILLS TO HAVE ITS
- 18 PERMIT UPDATED. WE'VE BEEN WORKING WITH YOUR STAFF
- 19 AND THE LEA FOR SEVERAL YEARS TO GET THIS ONE
- 20 FINALIZED.
- 21 THE SITE NOW AVERAGES ABOUT 75 TONS A
- 22 DAY AND HAS MAYBE 45 TO 50 CUSTOMERS ON THE AVERAGE
- 23 AND SERVES THE TOWN OF BLYTHE AS WELL AS THE

- 24 AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITIES AROUND THAT TOWN AND A
- VERY SMALL AMOUNT THAT COMES IN FROM ARONBERG,

- 1 ARIZONA, IMMEDIATELY ACROSS THE RIVER.
- 2 WE ARE ABOUT TO GO TO BID ON A
- 3 LANDFILL GAS EXTRACTION SYSTEM. I DON'T KNOW IF
- 4 THAT BEARS ON YOUR DECISION, BUT JUST BY WAY OF
- 5 INFORMATION, THAT'S ANOTHER PIECE OF DATA THAT I'LL
- 6 THROW IN THE PICTURE. WE WOULD URGE YOUR SUPPORT
- 7 AND APPROVAL OF THIS PERMIT.
- 8 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: DO YOU HANDLE WASTE FROM
- 9 THE PRISONS?
- 10 MR. NELSON: YES. YES, THEY HAVE QUITE AN
- 11 EXTENSIVE RECYCLING PROCESS ON SITE WHICH HELPS A
- 12 LOT AND THEN THE RESIDUAL COMES TO THIS LANDFILL.
- 13 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: THAT ANSWERS MY QUESTION
- 14 BEFORE I ASK IT.
- 15 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I JUST WANTED TO
- 16 MAKE A COMMENT. THIS WON'T AFFECT MY VOTE. IN THE
- 17 STAFF WRITE-UP ON PAGE 17 OR PAGE 2 OF THE ITEM,
- THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE, THERE'S A STATEMENT "NEW
- 19 DISPOSAL OCCURS ON TOP OF THE EXISTING FOOTPRINT,
- 20 ELIMINATING THE NEED FOR AN EXPENSE BUILDING NEW
- 21 LINED CELLS." I KNOW THERE ARE GOING TO BE A
- NUMBER OF FACILITIES THAT WE'RE GOING TO SEE HERE.
- 23 I'VE SPOKEN ON THIS ISSUE BEFORE.

24		I	DO HA	AVE A	CEF	RTAIN	DEGREE	OF	
25	DISCOMFORT	WITH	THAT	SORT	OF	PRESI	ENTATION	IIN	THE

- 1 SENSE THAT SUBTITLE D IN THE SPIRIT OF IT, I
- 2 BELIEVE, WAS TO LOOK TO A LINER-TYPE SYSTEM IN OUR
- 3 STATE AND NOT STRICTLY AT THE ISSUE OF EXPENSE ON
- 4 AVOIDING LINERS. I'M NOT SAYING THAT'S OCCURRING
- 5 HERE AND THAT THERE'S A WATER PROBLEM HERE, BUT I
- 6 CONTINUE TO HAVE SOME UNEASE OVER VERTICAL
- 7 EXPANSIONS ON UNLINED LANDFILLS. IT'S ALLOWED.
- 8 IT'S A WATER ISSUE.
- 9 I HOPE THE WATER BOARDS ARE DOING
- 10 THEIR JOB BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE ANY OVERSIGHT OVER
- 11 THIS ANYMORE. BUT I JUST FEEL THE NEED TO MAKE
- 12 THAT STATEMENT.
- 13 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY.
- 14 MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN.
- 15 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: QUESTIONS OR DISCUSSION?
- 16 MEMBER JONES: I DON'T HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.
- 17 I'D LIKE TO MOVE RESOLUTION 97-502.
- 18 MEMBER RELIS: SECOND.
- 19 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: WE HAVE A MOTION AND
- 20 SECOND ON THE ADOPTION OF 97-502. SECRETARY WILL
- 21 CALL THE ROLL ON THAT ONE.
- THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- MEMBER RELIS: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER JONES.

25 MEMBER JONES: AYE.

```
THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN FRAZEE.
 1
              CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AYE. MOTION IS
 2
      CARRIED. IF THERE'S NO OBJECTION TO CONSENT ON
 3
       THAT ONE, WE'LL RECOMMEND THAT ONE FOR CONSENT.
                    NOW, ITEM 5 IS THE CONSIDERATION OF
 5
 6
       THE ISSUANCE OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE FACILITY
       PERMIT FOR THE EDOM HILL SANITARY LANDFILL IN
 7
       RIVERSIDE COUNTY. STAFF REPORT, PLEASE.
 8
              MR. OTSUBO: THIS FACILITY IS LOCATED NEAR
 9
       THE CITY OF PALM SPRINGS ADJACENT TO THE CLOSED
10
11
       WHITEFEATHER FARMS COMPOST FACILITY AT THE BOUNDARY
      OF CATHEDRAL CITY. IT IS ALSO OWNED BY THE WASTE
12
      RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ON LAND -- IT'S
13
14
      OPERATED BY WASTE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ON
      LAND OWNED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.
15
                     ITS CURRENT PERMIT WAS ISSUED IN
16
       1992. THE PROPOSED PERMIT WOULD ALLOW THE SITE TO
17
       INCREASE PERMITTED TONNAGE FROM 1200 TO 2651 TONS
18
       PER DAY, INCREASE ITS MAXIMUM ELEVATION BY 40 FEET,
19
       INCREASE THE FACILITY SIZE BY 15 ACRES. IT ALSO
20
      REDUCES -- ACTUALLY REDUCES THE PERMITTED DISPOSAL
21
      FOOTPRINT FROM 400 TO 148 ACRES.
22
                    THE OPERATOR WISHES THE INCREASED THE
23
```

- 24 TONNAGE TO ACCEPT WASTE FORMERLY GOING TO THE NOW
- 25 CLOSED COACHELLA LANDFILL.

1	A STIPULATED ORDER OF COMPLIANCE WAS
2	ISSUED ON OCTOBER 22D, ALLOWING THE SITE TO ACCEPT
3	MORE THAN THE 1200 TONS PER DAY IN THE INTERIM. IT
4	GIVES THE OPERATOR UNTIL JULY 31, 1998, TO OBTAIN A
5	REVISED PERMIT. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT THE SITE
6	IS LOCATED ON THE MAIN SOUTHERN BRANCH OF THE SAN
7	ANDREAS FAULT.
8	AT THE TIME BOTH THE COMMITTEE AND
9	BOARD ITEMS WERE WRITTEN, STAFF HAD NOT YET
10	VERIFIED THE LEA'S FINDING OF CONFORMANCE WITH
11	PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE 50000 AND 50000.5, THE SITE'S
12	COMPLIANCE WITH STATE MINIMUM STANDARDS, THE
13	ADEQUACY OF THE CEQA DOCUMENTATION, OR ADEQUACY OF
14	THE FINANCIAL ASSURANCE REQUIREMENTS.
15	SINCE STAFF OF THE BOARD'S OFFICE OF
16	LOCAL ASSISTANCE HAVE VERIFIED CONFORMANCE WITH THE
17	COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, GENERAL PLAN,
18	AND ADJACENT LAND USES. ON OCTOBER 30TH PERMITTING
19	AND INSPECTION BRANCH STAFF CONDUCTED A JOINT
20	INSPECTION OF THE SITE WITH THE LEA AND NOTED NO
21	VIOLATIONS OF STATE MINIMUM STANDARDS.
22	FINANCIAL ASSURANCE STAFF HAVE
23	DETERMINED THAT THE FUNDING FOR CLOSURE-POSTCLOSURE

- 24 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATING LIABILITY DOCUMENTATION
- 25 ARE IN ORDER. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW SECTION STAFF

- 1 HAD REVIEWED AND COMMENTED ON THE DRAFT EIR, HAVE
- 2 RECENTLY REVIEWED THE FINAL EIR, AND BELIEVE THAT
- 3 THE LEAD AGENCY HAS MADE THE REQUIRED CEQA FINDINGS
- 4 AND RESPONDED TO STAFF COMMENTS.
- 5 THEREFORE, ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW STAFF
- 6 HAVE DETERMINED THAT THE CEQA DOCUMENTATION IS
- 7 ADEQUATE FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION FOR THOSE PROJECT
- 8 ACTIVITIES WHICH ARE WITHIN THIS AGENCY'S
- 9 JURISDICTION. PLEASE NOTE THAT CATHEDRAL CITY HAS
- 10 CHALLENGED THE ADEQUACY OF THE EIR, AND NO ACTION
- 11 HAS YET BEEN TAKEN IN THAT MATTER.
- 12 IN ADDITION, THE LEA HAS MADE THE
- 13 REQUIRED FINDINGS, THAT THE PROPOSED PERMIT IS
- 14 CONSISTENT WITH EXISTING CEQA DOCUMENTATION. STAFF
- 15 RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD ADOPT RESOLUTION 97-503,
- 16 CONCURRING IN THE ISSUANCE OF SOLID WASTE FACILITY
- PERMIT 33-AA-0011. AND THIS CONCLUDES MY
- 18 PRESENTATION.
- 19 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY.
- 20 MS. HOLK: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN. ABOUT THE
- 21 TIME THE COACHELLA LANDFILL WAS CLOSING, THERE WERE
- 22 THREE TRANSFER STATION PROJECTS THAT WERE GOING ON
- 23 IN THE COACHELLA VALLEY TO HELP ALLEVIATE SOME OF

- 24 THAT PROBLEM. IN THE MEANTIME THE COACHELLA VALLEY
- 25 ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT TRANSFER STATION PROJECT

HAS STALLED AND IS NO LONGER GOING FORWARD. THE TRANSFER STATION FOR THE CITY OF 2 INDIO IS AT THE EIR STAGE, AND THERE IS LOCAL 3 OPPOSITION TO THAT FACILITY. THIS BOARD PERMITTED THE COACHELLA 5 6 TRANSFER STATION AT THE SITE, AND THE CITY OF COACHELLA AND THE WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ARE 7 STILL WORKING ON TRYING TO GET THAT FACILITY UP. 8 9 SO AS OF TODAY, THERE ARE NO TRANSFER STATIONS TO 10 TAKE ANY OF THE WASTE THAT IS CURRENTLY GOING TO 11 EDOM HILL. IT IS THE ONLY REMAINING LARGE 12 CAPACITY LANDFILL IN THE AREA. THEY ARE CURRENTLY 13 14 EXCEEDING THEIR TONNAGES AND HAVE BEEN ISSUED A STIPULATED ORDER OF COMPLIANCE TO GET A NEW PERMIT 15 AND ARE BEING CONTINUED TO BE VIOLATED FOR THAT 16 17 TONNAGE. THIS REVISED PERMIT WOULD ALLEVIATE 18 THAT VIOLATION. EXTRA EQUIPMENT AND PERSONNEL WAS 19 MOVED FROM THE COACHELLA LANDFILL TO EDOM HILL 20 LANDFILL TO COVER THE INCREASE IN TONNAGE, AND 21 22 CURRENTLY THE INCREASE IN TONNAGE IS BEING HANDLED

23 WITH NO PROBLEMS.

24 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY.

25 MEMBER RELIS: I'M JUST WONDERING WAS

- 1 ANYONE HERE? I RECEIVED SOME TIME AGO, I THINK WE
- 2 ALL DID, A LETTER FROM CATHEDRAL CITY. I DON'T
- 3 KNOW IF ANYONE IS HERE. I'M SURPRISED IF THEY'RE
- 4 AS CONCERNED AS THEY ARE THAT THEY AREN'T HERE.
- 5 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: WE DO NOT HAVE A SPEAKER
- 6 SLIP.
- 7 MS. TOBIAS: I DID TALK TO THEIR ATTORNEY
- 8 THIS WEEK. HE SAID THEY WOULD PROBABLY BE GOING TO
- 9 THE BOARD MEETING, THAT THEIR REQUEST WAS THAT THE
- 10 COMMITTEE POSTPONE THIS HEARING UNTIL SUCH TIME AS
- 11 THEIR CEQA LAWSUIT IS RESOLVED.
- 12 I DISCUSSED WITH THEM, THAT WE HAVE
- AN OBLIGATION AS THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY TO CONTINUE
- AND TO ISSUE OUR PERMIT; THAT IF THE UNDERLYING
- 15 CEQA INFORMATION WAS INVALIDATED, THEN OUR PERMIT
- 16 WOULD BE VOID AND THEY WOULD HAVE TO GO BACK
- 17 THROUGH THE PROCESS.
- 18 MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT IF THEY DO
- 19 APPEAR, THEY WILL BE AT THE BOARD HEARING.
- 20 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: MR. NELSON.
- MR. NELSON: BOB NELSON AGAIN. MR.
- 22 CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, THIS IS, AS HAS
- 23 BEEN DESCRIBED, OUR ONLY REMAINING OUTLET IN THE

- COACHELLA VALLEY. THAT AREA HAS 250, 300,000
- 25 PEOPLE, AND THEY ARE NOW TAKING ALL OF THEIR WASTE

- 1 BY DIRECT HAUL TO THIS SITE. SO IT IS CRITICALLY
- 2 URGENT TO US TO GET THE PERMIT APPROVED, AND WE DO
- 3 CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THE CITIES TRYING TO DEVELOP
- 4 A TRANSFER STATION TO BE ABLE TO MOVE WASTE OUT OF
- 5 THE VALLEY.
- 6 EVEN WITH THIS PERMIT APPROVAL, IT
- 7 ADDS ONLY TWO YEARS TO THAT SITE LIFE AT THIS
- 8 LANDFILL. SITE LIFE IS ABOUT FOUR TO FOUR AND A
- 9 HALF YEARS WITHOUT THIS AND MAYBE SIX TO SIX AND A
- 10 HALF WITH IT.
- 11 WE ARE HOPING TO GET A TRANSFER
- 12 STATION PROJECT UP AND UNDER WAY DURING THE NEXT --
- 13 HOPEFULLY NEXT FEW MONTHS. AS THINGS GO WITH THESE
- 14 KINDS OF PROJECTS, IT MAY TAKE LONGER THAN THAT AND
- THEN BE ABLE TO MOVE SOME OF THE WASTE OUT OF THE
- 16 VALLEY.
- SO WE DO HAVE STAFF HERE FROM OUR
- 18 CONSULTANTS WHO DID THE ENGINEERING WORK ON THE
- 19 DESIGN. DON ANDREAS WITH EMCON IS HERE, AS WELL AS
- 20 DON HAYNES, WHO WORKED WITH US ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL
- 21 IMPACT REPORT. WE ALSO HAVE DON MADDOX OF REMY
- 22 THOMAS, WHO IS OUR LEGAL ADVISOR DEALING WITH THE
- 23 CHALLENGE BY THE CITY OF CATHEDRAL CITY. IF YOU

- NEED TO TALK TO ANY OF THEM ABOUT ISSUES THAT THEY
- 25 HAVE DEALT WITH, WE'D BE HAPPY TO HAVE THEM COME

- 1 FORWARD. BUT SHORT OF THAT, I WOULD SIMPLY URGE
- 2 YOUR APPROVAL OF THIS PERMIT. THANK YOU.
- 3 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: THANK YOU. QUESTIONS?
- 4 MEMBER JONES: I'LL MOVE WE ADOPT
- 5 RESOLUTION 97-503.
- 6 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I'LL SECOND
- 7 THAT, VOICING MY EARLIER CONCERN OVER A MAJOR
- 8 EXPANSION OVER AN UNLINED LANDFILL, BUT IT'S A
- 9 WATER BOARD ISSUE.
- 10 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY. WE HAVE A MOTION
- AND SECOND ON THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 97-503.
- 12 WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL ON THAT.
- THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- 14 MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER JONES.
- 16 MEMBER JONES: AYE.
- 17 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN FRAZEE.
- 18 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AYE. MOTION IS
- 19 CARRIED. BECAUSE OF THE POTENTIAL FOR FURTHER
- OPPOSITION, I THINK THIS ONE SHOULD BE MOVED TO THE
- 21 BOARD FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION.
- NOW WE'RE READY FOR ITEM 6, THE
- 23 CONSIDERATION OF A NEW SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT

- FOR THE MUSTANG HILL LANDFILL IN KINGS COUNTY.
- MS. POROLI: GOOD MORNING. I'M BEATRICE

- 1 POROLI WITH THE PERMITS BRANCH. THE OWNER AND THE
- 2 OPERATOR OF THE MUSTANG HILL LANDFILL IS KINGS
- 3 WASTE AND RECYCLING AUTHORITY. MR. MICHAEL ADAMS
- 4 IS THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.
- 5 THE PROPOSED PERMIT IS FOR THE
- 6 OPERATION OF A NEW LANDFILL TO BE LOCATED ON 340
- 7 ACRES WITH A 74-ACRE DISPOSAL FOOTPRINT. THE
- 8 PROPOSED LANDFILL WILL RECEIVE A MAXIMUM OF 500
- 9 TONS PER DAY OF NONHAZARDOUS RESIDENTIAL,
- 10 COMMERCIAL, AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE FROM KINGS
- 11 COUNTY. THE LIFE OF THE LANDFILL IS ESTIMATED TO
- BE 85 YEARS.
- 13 STAFF REVIEWED THE PROPOSED PERMIT
- 14 AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION AND HAVE FOUND THAT IT
- 15 MEETS ALL OF THE REQUIREMENTS ON PAGE 29 OF YOUR
- 16 PACKAGE AND ACCEPTABLE FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE
- 17 BOARD.
- 18 IN CONCLUSION, STAFF RECOMMEND THAT
- 19 THE BOARD ADOPT SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT
- 20 DECISION NO. 97-483, CONCURRING WITH THE ISSUANCE
- 21 OF SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT NO. 16-AA-0013. MR.
- LUIS FLORES, REPRESENTING THE LEA, IS ON MY LEFT
- 23 AND MR. MICHAEL ADAMS, THE OPERATOR, ARE PRESENT TO

- 24 ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS THAT YOU MAY HAVE. THIS
- 25 CONCLUDES STAFF'S PRESENTATION.

```
CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: MR. FLORES, DID YOU HAVE
 1
 2
   ANY COMMENTS?
              MR. FLORES: YES. THANK YOU. GOOD
 3
      MORNING. KINGS COUNTY CURRENTLY HAS TWO MUNICIPAL
      SOLID WASTE FACILITIES IN THE COUNTY. ONE OF THOSE
 5
 6
      FACILITIES SERVICES THE MAJORITY OF THE COUNTY,
      PROBABLY ABOUT 70 TO 80 PERCENT MINIMUM. THE OTHER
 7
      SERVICES THE MUNICIPALITY. THE MAJOR MUNICIPAL
 8
9
      SOLID WASTE FACILITY IN OUR COUNTY IS DUE TO CLOSE
10
      WITHIN THE NEXT 12 MONTHS, AND THIS WOULD BE A VERY
11
      GOOD ALTERNATIVE FOR THAT CLOSURE. AND SO WE WOULD
      LIKE TO SEE CONCURRENCE BY THE BOARD ON THIS
12
     FACILITY. THANK YOU.
13
14
              MEMBER RELIS: AS I UNDERSTAND, THIS IS
      SOMETHING OF A BACKUP OPTION, ISN'T IT, IF THE
15
     OTHER PERMIT -- PERMITTED LANDFILL, WHICH IS --
16
              MR. FLORES: KETTLEMAN HILLS FACILITY.
17
              MEMBER RELIS: -- KETTLEMAN HILLS SHOULD
18
      RUN INTO PROBLEMS, THIS WOULD BE YOUR OPTION.
19
              MR. FLORES: THAT'S CORRECT.
20
               MEMBER JONES: I THINK, MR. CHAIRMAN,
21
22 KINGS COUNTY, I WENT DOWN AND LOOKED AT A PRETTY
```

23 ELABORATE, PRETTY EXTENSIVE MATERIALS RECOVERY

- 24 FACILITY THAT WAS BUILT. THIS MAKES SENSE THAT
- 25 THE -- THIS INTEGRATION BETWEEN THE MRF AND THIS

1

20

22

```
CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY.
             MR. FLORES: I'D ALSO LIKE TO THANK
 3
     BEATRICE FOR HER ASSISTANCE. I'M RELATIVELY NEW IN
     THE SOLID WASTE PROGRAMS, AND HER ASSISTANCE HAS
 5
 6
      BEEN VERY HELPFUL TO ME.
 7
              CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY.
 8
             MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE
 9
   TO MOVE RESOLUTION 97-483.
10
             MEMBER RELIS: I'LL SECOND.
11
             CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: WE HAVE A MOTION AND
     SECOND ON THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 97-483. IF
12
    THE SECRETARY WILL CALL THE ROLL ON THAT.
13
14
             THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
       MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
15
     THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER JONES.
16
     MEMBER JONES: AYE.
17
             THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN FRAZEE.
18
             CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AYE. THE MOTION IS
19
```

CARRIED. IF THERE'S NO OBJECTION, WE WILL

23 CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NOW, WE ARE READY FOR THE

21 RECOMMEND CONSENT ON THAT ITEM.

LANDFILL, SO I DON'T HAVE ANY PROBLEM WITH IT.

- FOR A MAJOR WASTE TIRE FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE
- 25 CALIFORNIA ASBESTOS MONOFILL IN CALAVERAS COUNTY.

```
MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
 1
       MICHAEL KEFFER WILL MAKE THE STAFF PRESENTATION.
 2
                    BEFORE HE BEGINS, I'D LIKE TO BRIEFLY
 3
       ACKNOWLEDGE BOTH MICHAEL AND BILL ISHMAEL OF THE
       DIVISION CEQA STAFF FOR THEIR VERY EXPEDITIOUS WORK
 5
 6
       ON THIS ITEM AND THE NEXT ONE. I REALLY APPRECIATE
 7
       IT.
 8
               MR. KEFFER: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN,
       MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. AGENDA ITEM NO. 7 IS AN
 9
       INFORMATIONAL ITEM TO ALERT MEMBERS OF THE
10
       COMMITTEE TO AN ITEM THAT WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE
11
       FULL BOARD AT ITS MEETING ON NOVEMBER 19, 1997. AT
12
      THAT TIME THE BOARD WILL BE REQUESTED TO CONSIDER
13
14
      THE ADOPTION OF A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR A MAJOR
       WASTE TIRE FACILITY PERMIT FOR CALIFORNIA ASBESTOS
15
       MONOFILL, COMMONLY CALLED CAM, IN CALAVERAS COUNTY.
16
                    AS PART OF THEIR MAJOR WASTE TIRE
17
       FACILITY PERMIT APPLICATION, CAM PRESENTED VARIOUS
18
       ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS TO SATISFY THAT PORTION OF
19
       THE APPLICATION REQUIRING COMPLIANCE WITH THE
20
       CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT. AFTER
21
      DETERMINING THAT THESE DOCUMENTS DID NOT ADEQUATELY
22
     COVER THE STORAGE OF WASTE TIRES ON THE PREMISES OF
```

23

- 24 CAM, AND ACTING AS THE LEAD AGENCY, BOARD CEQA
- 25 STAFF PREPARED AN INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE

1 DECLARATION. 2 THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS FILED WITH THE STATE CLEARINGHOUSE ON OCTOBER 16, 1997, 3 AND DISTRIBUTED TO RESPONSIBLE AND INTERESTED AGENCIES FOR COMMENT. THE COMMENT PERIOD 5 6 TERMINATES ON NOVEMBER THE 17TH, 1997, AND STAFF WILL BRING THE ISSUE OF ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE 7 DECLARATION TO THE FULL BOARD ON NOVEMBER 19, 1997. 8 9 ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS I MIGHT ANSWER FOR MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE? 10 11 MOVE ON TO ITEM NO. 8, WHICH REQUESTS THE COMMITTEE CONSIDER THE APPROVAL OF A MAJOR 12 WASTE TIRE FACILITY PERMIT FOR CAM. ON SEPTEMBER 13 14 17, 1997, CAM SUBMITTED A MAJOR WASTE TIRE FACILITY PERMIT APPLICATION, DETAILING PROPOSED PLANS TO 15 STORE UP TO 580 TONS OF WHOLE, UNSHREDDED WASTE 16 TIRES AT THEIR FACILITY NEAR COPPEROPOLIS, 17 18 CALIFORNIA. THE APPLICATION WAS DEEMED COMPLETE 19 ON OCTOBER THE 16TH, AND A PREPERMIT INSPECTION WAS 20 CONDUCTED BY BOARD AND CALAVERAS COUNTY PERSONNEL 21 ON OCTOBER 27, 1997. ALTHOUGH THE APPLICATION WAS 22 SUPPLEMENTED BY NUMEROUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS,

23

- AS I'VE ALREADY STATED, BOARD STAFF PREPARED THE
- 25 NEGATIVE DECLARATION TO SATISFY CEQA REQUIREMENTS.

DURING THE PREPERMIT INSPECTION OF OCTOBER 27, 1997, IT WAS DETERMINED THAT THE FACILITY MET OR 2 EXCEEDED THE TECHNICAL STANDARDS FOR FIRE 3 PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION, VECTOR CONTROL, FACILITY ACCESS, AND THE STORAGE OF WASTE TIRES. 5 6 CAM IS PRESENTLY PERMITTED TO ACCEPT ASBESTOS-CONTAINING WASTE, AND MINOR ALTERATIONS 7 WILL BE REQUIRED IN ORDER TO PREPARE FOR THE 8 9 ACCEPTANCE OF WASTE TIRES. FINANCIAL ASSURANCE MECHANISMS 10 11 REQUIRED BY STATUTE AND REGULATION FOR A MAJOR WASTE TIRE FACILITY PERMIT WERE SUBMITTED AS PART 12 OF THE APPLICATION, EXAMINED BY BOARD STAFF, AND 13 14 DETERMINED ADEQUATE FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT. THE OPERATION PLAN AND EMERGENCY 15 RESPONSE PLAN SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION WERE 16 ALSO DEEMED COMPLETE. 17 PENDING THE APPROVAL OF THE NEGATIVE 18 DECLARATION FOR CAM ON NOVEMBER 19TH, STAFF 19 RECOMMENDS THE COMMITTEE FORWARD THIS ITEM TO THE 20 BOARD WITH SUPPORT FOR ADOPTION OF PERMIT DECISION 21 97-506, APPROVING ISSUANCE OF A MAJOR WASTE TIRE 22

23 FACILITY PERMIT NO. 05-TI-0726.

24			REPRES	ENTAT	TIVES (OF C	AM ARE	PRES	SENT	IN
25	THE	AUDIENCE	TODAY.	ARE	THERE	ANY	QUEST	IONS	YOU	
				4.5						

CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: I UNDERSTAND THIS PERMIT 2 IS FOR THE STORAGE OF TIRES ONLY AND NOT FOR THE 3 ACTUAL MONOFILLING. MR. KEFFER: THAT IS CORRECT. IT IS FOR 5 6 THE ABOVE-GROUND STORAGE OF WASTE TIRES. 7 MEMBER RELIS: MY QUESTION WOULD -- IS CONCERNING -- LET'S SEE. THE INTENT, THEN, DOWN 8 9 THE ROAD WOULD BE TO MONOFILL? MR. KEFFER: THAT IS CORRECT. 10 11 MEMBER RELIS: SO THIS WOULD BE SOMEWHAT ANALOGOUS TO AN EARLIER DISCUSSION WE HAD HERE 12 REGARDING OXFORD WHERE WE WERE LOOKING TO A 13 14 POTENTIAL TIRE MONOFILL OPTION THERE AS A --MS. RICE: THE OPERATOR MAY WANT TO SPEAK 15 TO THIS MORE FULLY, BUT MY UNDERSTANDING IS THIS IS 16 NOT SO MUCH A BACKUP AS THEY WILL ULTIMATELY NEED 17 THE TWO AUTHORIZATIONS BECAUSE THEY WILL HAVE SOME 18 AREA ABOVE-GROUND WHERE THEY ARE PROCESSING TIRES 19 PRIOR TO PLACEMENT IN THE MONOFILL. SO ULTIMATELY 20 THEY WOULD NEED BOTH THE PERMIT OR SOME KIND OF 21 APPROVAL TO OPERATE THE MONOFILL AS WELL AS THE 22

23 PERMIT THAT YOU ARE BEING REQUESTED TO ACT ON

HAVE OF STAFF OR REPRESENTATIVES FROM THIS COMPANY?

- 24 TODAY. SO THIS IS NOT INSTEAD OF A PERMIT FOR THE
- MONOFILL.

MEMBER RELIS: NO. I UNDERSTAND THAT. MY 1 COMMENTS WERE MORE DIRECTED TO WE DIDN'T KNOW MUCH 2 ABOUT MONOFILLS WHEN WE WERE DEALING WITH THE 3 OXFORD CASE, SO THIS IS ONE FOR US TO STUDY CAREFULLY BECAUSE SHOULD THIS BECOME A MORE 5 6 WIDESPREAD OPTION, WE NEED TO KNOW, WELL, IS THERE ANY CHANCE OF, YOU KNOW, SPONTANEOUS COMBUSTION 7 WITHIN THE MONOFILL ITSELF DOWN THE ROAD. I'M NOT 8 9 TALKING TO THE PERMIT BEFORE US TODAY. MS. RICE: CORRECT. AND WE ARE CURRENTLY 10 11 WORKING ON AN ORDER THAT WOULD GOVERN THE OPERATION OF THE NONFILL ITSELF, SO THE TWO WOULD WORK IN 12 TANDEM. 13 14 MEMBER JONES: MR. RELIS, THE ISSUES THAT WE HAD WITH THE OXFORD ONE, WELL, ALL THREE OF US 15 HAD, WERE VERY, VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THOSE THINGS. 16 I KNOW MR. FRAZEE HAS BEEN OUT TO CAM; I WENT OUT 17 TO CAM. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I HAVE A REAL 18 COMFORT LEVEL WITH IS THAT ALL OF THE ENGINEERS 19 THAT ARE -- THAT HAVE BEEN THE REPUTED EXPERTS ON 20 WHY THOSE TIRE FIRES HAVE HAPPENED IN SHREDDED 21 ROADWAYS AND THINGS LIKE THAT ARE PART OF THE 22

PROJECT THAT CAM HAS HIRED TO MAKE SURE THAT THEIR

23

- OPERATIONAL STANDARDS WHEN THEY DO START THE
- 25 MONOFILL ELIMINATE WHAT IS -- NOBODY KNOWS FOR

```
SURE -- BUT WHAT'S CONSIDERED TO BE WHAT PROBABLY
 1
       STARTED THOSE FIRES, THOSE TYPES OF THINGS.
 2
                     AND I KNOW THAT WHEN WE HAD -- WHEN
 3
       WE HAD OUR ENGINEER FROM BACK EAST, AND I CAN'T
       THINK OF HIS NAME RIGHT NOW, OUR CIVIL ENGINEER,
 5
 6
       DANA HUMPHREYS, SAID THAT ONE OF THE BIG ISSUES
       WERE THE ORGANICS THAT WERE WITHIN THE SOIL THAT
 7
       EVIDENTLY HAD HELPED FUEL THE FIRE WITH THE SHREDS
 8
 9
       HEATING UP, YOU KNOW, THE METAL SHRED THAT IS AT
       THE END OF THE TIRE SHRED.
10
                    AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I LEARNED
11
       WITH CAM IS THAT BECAUSE OF THEIR PROCESS PULLING
12
       ASBESTOS OUT OF THE MATERIAL, THAT THE PH. IS 7.
13
14
       THERE ARE NO ORGANICS LEFT IN THAT MATERIAL THEY'RE
       GOING TO BE COVERING WITH. IT KIND OF IS A
15
       UNIQUE -- PRETTY UNIQUE SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES. BUT
16
       I THINK WHAT -- I'VE BEEN KIND OF BEING KEPT UP TO
17
       SPEED ON THIS ONE. AND I THINK THAT THE CAM IS
18
       WORKING WITH STAFF; AND AS THIS THING GOES ALONG,
19
       THERE'S GOING TO BE A LOT OF SHARING OF INFORMATION
20
       BECAUSE WE WERE ALL VERY CONCERNED THAT WE PERMIT
21
22
       SOMETHING THAT WOULD CREATE AN ENVIRONMENTAL
```

DISASTER AND THAT PROBABLY WASN'T GOOD POLICY. BUT

23

- 24 THIS IS WORKING OUT -- SEEMS TO BE WORKING OUT
- 25 PRETTY WELL SO FAR.

```
CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: MR. TONEY, DID YOU WISH
 1
   TO COMMENT ON THIS ITEM AT ALL?
 2
              MR. TONEY: JUST TO SAY THAT I'M AVAILABLE
 3
      TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS THAT YOU MIGHT HAVE.
              CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: NOW, AS I UNDERSTAND IT,
 5
 6
      THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS FOR INFORMATION ONLY.
 7
              MR. DIER: YES. UPON REFLECTION, I THINK
      STAFF WOULD RECOMMEND THAT THE COMMITTEE PROBABLY
 8
9
      FORWARD THAT TO THE BOARD WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION,
10
      THEN WE'LL FINISH THE COMMENT PERIOD AND REPORT
11
     BACK AT THE BOARD MEETING.
              CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: BOTH THE PERMIT AND
12
      THE --
13
14
              MS. TOBIAS: I THINK YOU CAN RECOMMEND IF
      YOU WOULD WANT THE PERMIT APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE
15
      APPROVAL, FINISHING THE COMMENT PERIOD AND THE
16
      APPROVAL OF THE NEG DEC. I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM
17
     WITH THAT.
18
              MEMBER RELIS: I WOULD SO MOVE.
19
              MEMBER JONES: I'LL SECOND.
20
              CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: WE HAVE A MOTION AND
21
22 SECOND ON THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 97-506 WITH
```

THE PROVISO THAT THIS IS A RECOMMENDATION TO THE

- 24 FULL BOARD PENDING ADOPTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL
- 25 IMPACT -- NEGATIVE DECLARATION. IF THE SECRETARY

```
WILL CALL THE ROLL ON THAT.
             THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
       MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
 3
             THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER JONES.
             MEMBER JONES: AYE.
 5
 6
              THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN FRAZEE.
              CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AYE. MOTION IS CARRIED.
                   NOW WE'RE READY FOR ITEM 10, THE
 8
9
     CONSIDERATION OF TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION AND
     DESIGNATION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT
10
11
      SERVICES DEPARTMENT AS THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
     FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.
12
             MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND
13
      MEMBERS. MARY COYLE AND CHRISTINE MCCRACKEN WILL
14
      PROVIDE THE STAFF PRESENTATION.
15
               MS. COYLE: MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS, ON
16
      JULY 29, '97, THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO WITHDREW THE
17
      DESIGNATION OF THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO DEPARTMENT
18
      OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AS THEIR LOCAL ENFORCEMENT
19
20
      AGENCY.
                   BOARD STAFF WAS PROVIDED NOTICE OF
21
22 THIS ACTION BY LETTER AND A COPY OF THE RESOLUTION
```

23 ON AUGUST 20TH. THE LOCAL GOVERNING BODY IS

- 24 REQUIRED TO GIVE THE BOARD 90 DAYS' NOTICE BEFORE
- THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE WITHDRAWAL OF DESIGNA-

- 1 TION. THE EFFECTIVE DATE HAS BEEN DETERMINED TO BE
- NOVEMBER 18TH.
- 3 THE CITY SUBMITTED THE REQUIRED
- 4 PAPERWORK FOR THEIR CERTIFICATION ON OCTOBER 15TH.
- 5 CHRISTINE MCCRACKEN WILL PROVIDE THE DETAILS OF
- 6 THAT PACKAGE.
- 7 MS. MCCRACKEN: GOOD MORNING. AS YOU
- 8 KNOW, THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE ALLOWS LOCAL
- 9 GOVERNING BODIES TO DESIGNATE AN ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
- 10 TO CARRY OUT THE SOLID WASTE PERMITTING,
- 11 INSPECTION, AND ENFORCEMENT DUTIES IN THEIR
- 12 JURISDICTION. REGULATIONS REQUIRE A DESIGNATED
- 13 LOCAL AGENCY DEVELOP, SUBMIT FOR BOARD APPROVAL,
- 14 AND ADOPT AN ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN.
- 15 THE EPP NEEDS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE
- 16 LEA MEETS ALL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION. AS
- OF AUGUST 1ST, 1992, THE BOARD CAN APPROVE A
- 18 DESIGNATION IF IT FINDS THAT THE DESIGNATED
- 19 ENFORCEMENT AGENCY IS CAPABLE OF FULFILLING ITS
- 20 RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM AND
- 21 MEETS THE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS ADOPTED BY THE
- BOARD.
- FOR A LOCAL AGENCY TO BE CERTIFIED BY

- THE BOARD, THE ENFORCEMENT AGENCY MUST HAVE THE
- 25 FOLLOWING: TECHNICAL EXPERTISE, ADEQUATE STAFF

RESOURCES, ADEQUATE BUDGET RESOURCES, ADEQUATE 1 TRAINING, THE EXISTENCE OF AT LEAST ONE PERMITTED 2 SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT WITHIN THE JURISDICTION 3 OF THE LOCAL AGENCY, NO OPERATIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN ANY OF THE TYPES OF FACILITIES OR SITES THAT 5 6 PERMITS, INSPECTS, OR ENFORCES, AND A SOLE -- BE A SOLE ENFORCEMENT AGENCY FOR THE LEA JURISDICTION. 7 8 THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO HAS REQUESTED 9 CERTIFICATION FOR ALL FOUR TYPES OF INSPECTION, PERMITTING, AND ENFORCEMENT DUTIES. BOARD STAFF 10 11 HAS REVIEWED THE DESIGNATION INFORMATION PACKAGE AND THE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN SUBMITTED BY THE 12 CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT 13 14 AND HAS FOUND THE DOCUMENTATION MEETS THE REQUIRE-MENTS OF STATUTE AND REGULATION. 15 STAFF HAS RECENTLY LEARNED THAT THE 16 CITY MANAGER HAS VACATED HIS OFFICE. STAFF WILL 17 NEED TO OBTAIN A NEW FORM 1000 SIGNED BY A 18 QUALIFIED REPRESENTATIVE PRIOR TO THE BOARD MEETING 19 TO COMPLETE ALL REQUIRED PAPERWORK. 20 THERE IS AN ITEM TO NOTE WHICH MAKES 21 THIS REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATION UNIQUE. THE CITY OF 22 SAN DIEGO PROPOSES TO UTILIZE UNDER CONTRACT A 23

- 24 PROGRAM MANAGER AND VARIOUS LEA STAFF FROM OTHER
- 25 CERTIFIED LEA JURISDICTIONS UNTIL JULY 1ST OF

OWN PROGRAM MANAGER IN ADDITION TO FILLING AN 2 INSPECTOR AND ENGINEER POSITION. 3 THE CITY IS FULLY COMMITTED TO ASSUMING AND PERFORMING ALL DUTIES AND RESPONSI-5 6 BILITIES OF A CERTIFIED LEA ON NOVEMBER 19, 1997, WITH THIS STAFFING ARRANGEMENT. 7 8 THE OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE BOARD 9 REGARDING THIS REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATION ARE FOUND, 10 I BELIEVE, ON PAGE 57 OF YOUR PACKET. AND MARY 11 COYLE WILL PRESENT THOSE. MS. COYLE: BASED ON THE PAPERWORK WE 12 RECEIVED AND PENDING RECEIPT OF THE UPDATED FORM 13 14 1000, BOARD STAFF DO RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE EPP, APPROVE THE DESIGNATION, AND ISSUE 15 TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION FOR THE JURISDICTION. THE 16 TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION IS ALLOWED IN REGULATION 17 BASED ON -- AND WE ARE RECOMMENDING THAT BASED ON 18 THE FACT THAT THE AGENCY HAS NOT HAD AN ABILITY TO 19

SHOW THEIR EXPERIENCE IN PERFORMING DUTIES AND

RESPONSIBILITIES OF A LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.

ADOPT RESOLUTION 97-508. DAVID CAREY, THE

THEREFORE, WE RECOMMEND THE BOARD

20

21

22

23

1998. BY THAT TIME THE CITY INTENDS TO HIRE THEIR

- 24 CONSULTANT FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, LISA WOOD,
- 25 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT, AND ELMER HEAP,

- 1 CITY ATTORNEY, IS IN THE AUDIENCE TO ANSWER ANY
- 2 QUESTIONS THAT THEY MAY BE AVAILABLE FOR. ARE
- 3 THERE ANY QUESTIONS OF STAFF?
- 4 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: QUESTIONS?
- 5 MEMBER RELIS: I HAVE JUST IN TERMS OF
- 6 THIS ARRANGEMENT OF USING CONSULTANTS, LET ME
- 7 UNDERSTAND. I'VE DISCUSSED THIS WITH MR. CAREY AND
- 8 I THINK I UNDERSTAND HIS ROLE. THE OTHER PARTIES
- 9 WOULD BE CONTRACTED TO DO THIS WORK, AND THEY'RE
- 10 CURRENTLY DOING -- THEY'RE CURRENTLY EMPLOYED IN
- 11 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES. IS THAT SO?
- MS. COYLE: YES. HE HAS IDENTIFIED
- 13 SEVERAL INDIVIDUALS THAT ARE CURRENTLY ASSIGNED TO
- 14 CERTIFIED LEA JURISDICTIONS IN OTHER PARTS OF THE
- 15 STATE, AND THEY ARE HAVING ABILITIES TO BE ABLE TO
- 16 FULFILL SOME WORK ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN THE CITY OF
- 17 SAN DIEGO.
- 18 MEMBER RELIS: LET ME JUST PURSUE FOR A
- 19 MINUTE. OKAY. THEY HAVE FULL-TIME JOBS, I TAKE
- 20 IT.
- MS. COYLE: SOME OF THEM DON'T.
- 22 MEMBER RELIS: IS THIS A MOONLIGHTING
- 23 OPERATION OR WHAT? I JUST NEED TO KNOW THAT --

- 24 LEA'S ARE USUALLY AVAILABLE DURING NORMAL HOURS AND
- TO DO NORMAL INSPECTIONS. AND I JUST WANT TO BE

- 1 ASSURED THAT THE INTEGRITY OF THIS APPROACH IS NOT
- 2 COMPROMISED BY LACK OF AVAILABILITY.
- 3 MR. UNSELL: TOM UNSELL. SPEAKING FROM
- 4 THE DOCUMENTATION THAT WE RECEIVED, WE WOULD NOT
- 5 HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF WHETHER THAT'S MOONLIGHTING OR
- 6 WHAT THOSE ABILITIES WOULD BE, BUT I THINK PERHAPS
- 7 THE CITY REPRESENTATIVE AND THE PROPOSED LEA MAY BE
- 8 ABLE TO SPEAK TO THAT ISSUE.
- 9 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: LET'S HEAR FROM MR.
- 10 CAREY.
- MR. CAREY: MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN,
- 12 MEMBERS. DAVE CAREY REPRESENTING THE CITY OF SAN
- 13 DIEGO. I'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS.
- 14 POINT OF CLARIFICATION WITH REGARD TO
- 15 FORM 1000 FIRST. THAT WAS SIGNED BY OUR DEPUTY
- 16 CITY MANAGER, WHO IS STILL EMPLOYED, AND THAT IS AN
- 17 AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE ON THAT FORM 1000.
- 18 WITH REGARD TO CONTRACT STAFF, IT
- 19 WILL CERTAINLY BE A LOGISTIC SCHEDULING CHALLENGE.
- 20 I HAVE OVER EIGHT INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE COMMITTED
- OVER ALMOST TWO FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STAFF. WE
- 22 HAVE A FULL-TIME CIVIL ENGINEER WITH THE CITY OF
- 23 SAN DIEGO WHO IS ASSIGNED TO THE PROGRAM. SO WE

- 24 HAVE ONE FULL-TIME PERSON THERE.
- OUR TIME TASK ANALYSIS HAS INDICATED

```
WE ALSO NEED ONE FULL-TIME INSPECTOR. I HAVE THE
 1
       EQUIVALENT OF 1.8 PART-TIME STAFF. SO WE FEEL THAT
 2
       WE HAVE THE ABILITY WITH THE FLEX DAYS THAT THE
 3
       INDIVIDUALS HAVE THAT ARE CURRENTLY WORKING WITH
       SOME OF THE OTHER LEA'S, THAT THEY ARE GOING TO BE
 5
 6
       ABLE TO GIVE US THE EQUIVALENT WITHOUT HAVING TO
       TECHNICALLY MOONLIGHT AND HAVE TO FIGURE OUT WHEN
 7
       THE FULL MOON IS OUT THERE, SO WE'RE OUT THERE ON
 8
 9
       THE FACILITY, BUT A MONDAY THROUGH SATURDAY-TYPE OF
       OPERATION. WE WILL BE FULLY PREPARED TO GO FORWARD
10
11
       WITH THAT KIND OF INSPECTION AND PERMITTING
      ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.
12
               MEMBER RELIS: LET ME PURSUE THAT A LITTLE
13
14
       FURTHER. I MEAN IT IS AN UNUSUAL -- WE ALL HAVE TO
       ADMIT THIS IS SOMEWHAT AN UNUSUAL ARRANGEMENT. AND
15
       THIS IS A LARGE JURISDICTION. I MEAN WE MIGHT SEE
16
       THIS TYPE OF PROPOSAL IN SOME OF OUR RURAL COUNTIES
17
       WITH THE PROBLEMS THEY HAVE WITH STAFFING, BUT I
18
       MEAN THIS IS SAN DIEGO, ONE OF THE BIGGEST
19
       POPULATION CENTERS IN CALIFORNIA.
20
                    AND SO I THINK IT'S REASONABLE TO
21
       REALLY PURSUE THIS POINT BECAUSE ENFORCEMENT IS A
22
```

DAY-IN AND DAY-OUT MATTER. IT DOESN'T AND IT

- 24 SHOULD NOT -- ITS PERFORMANCE SHOULD NOT BE
- 25 COMPROMISED BY SCHEDULING CONFLICTS. I'M JUST

```
WONDERING, PUTTING MYSELF IN THAT POSITION, I'M ONE
 1
       OF THESE CONTRACT PEOPLE, AND I HAVE A FULL-TIME
 2
       JOB. AND WHERE IS MY PRIMARY ALLEGIANCE? IT'S
 3
       GOING TO BE TO MY FULL-TIME POSITION. YOU CALL ME
       OR I DON'T KNOW WHO WOULD CALL AND SAY, "I NEED AN
 5
       INSPECTION." "WELL, GEE. I'M TIED UP TODAY."
 6
 7
                    HOW -- HOW DO WE -- WHAT ASSURANCE DO
 8
       WE HAVE IN THIS ARRANGEMENT THAT THAT WON'T HAPPEN
 9
       BECAUSE OTHERWISE WE'VE FAILED OUR PRIMARY
10
       FUNCTION?
11
              MR. CAREY: I CERTAINLY UNDERSTAND WHERE
       YOU ARE COMING FROM AS TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC AND
12
      CERTAINLY PROTECT THOSE FACILITIES THAT WE HAVE.
13
14
       BUT I'VE ENSURED -- NO. 1, I'M A REGISTERED
       ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SPECIALIST MYSELF WITH THREE
15
       YEARS. EVEN THOUGH I CONCUR IN THE RECOMMENDATION
16
       THAT STAFF HAS MADE TO GIVE A CITY OF SAN DIEGO A
17
       TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION, I'VE HAD THREE YEARS
18
       EXPERIENCE PERSONALLY AS THE LEA OF SAN DIEGO
19
       COUNTY IN 1983 TO '85. OBVIOUSLY THAT PRECEDED THE
20
       NEW LAWS THAT CAME IN IN AB 939, WHAT HAVE YOU.
21
                    BUT I DO HAVE THAT EXPERIENCE MYSELF,
22
```

SO I PERSONALLY WOULD MAKE INSPECTIONS MYSELF. I

- 24 WILL BE AVAILABLE FULL TIME MYSELF. I'LL HAVE A
- 25 STAFF ENGINEER FULL TIME AVAILABLE TO ME, SO THOSE

1	ARE TWO EQUIVALENTS RIGHT THERE. THE PART-TIME
2	STAFF THAT WE CALLED ON WILL NOT BE, EVEN THOUGH
3	WE'VE GIVEN OURSELVES THAT WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY TO
4	JULY OF 1998, WE CERTAINLY HOPE TO HAVE QUALIFIED
5	STAFF ON BOARD MUCH SOONER THAN THAT. THE PROCESS
6	IS ALREADY GOING FORWARD FOR THE RECRUITMENT
7	PROCESS, JOB CLASSIFICATIONS, AND WHAT HAVE YOU.
8	SO WE'RE GOING TO BE HIRING FULL-TIME STAFF ON A
9	VERY IMMEDIATE BASIS, AND HOPEFULLY THE PROGRAM
10	MANAGER WILL BE THE FIRST PERSON THAT WE HIRE. I'M
11	ONLY INTERIM OR IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM MANAGER.
12	AND THEN WE'LL HAVE A FULL-TIME PROGRAM MANAGER ON
13	BOARD WHO WILL THEN HIRE THE QUALIFIED STAFF.
14	WE HAVE RIGHT IN OUR OWN JURISDICTION
15	THE FORMER LEA IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY. WE HAVE TWO
16	INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE GIVEN US HAVE COMMITTED TO
17	ME ON PAPER, WRITTEN COMMITMENT AGREEMENTS, THAT
18	THEY WILL GIVE ME TEN DAYS JUST RIGHT THERE IN SAN
19	DIEGO, PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN SAN DIEGO. WE ALSO HAVE
20	AN INDIVIDUAL WHO IS THE LEA FOR IMPERIAL COUNTY,
21	JERRY QUICK THIS IS ALL IN THE EPP WHO IS A
22	CONTRACT EMPLOYEE WITH IMPERIAL, WHO ONLY WORKS 12
23	DAYS A MONTH IN IMPERIAL. HE'S WILLING TO GIVE US

- 24 EIGHT DAYS IN SAN DIEGO THOSE OTHER EIGHT DAYS. SO
- THAT WOULDN'T BE IN DIRECT CONFLICT WITH ANY OTHER

- 1 WORKING COMMITMENT THAT HE HAS.
- 2 AND SO WITH THOSE THREE INDIVIDUALS
- 3 ALONE, TWO FROM SAN DIEGO COUNTY AND THE IMPERIAL
- 4 COUNTY JERRY QUICK INDIVIDUAL, WE HAVE BASICALLY
- 5 FULL-TIME STAFF THAT WE CAN SPREAD OVER THE FULL
- 6 COURSE OF THE TIME.
- 7 WE ALSO HAVE ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES
- 8 WORKING FOR OTHER LEA'S IN LOS ANGELES, RIVERSIDE,
- 9 ORANGE COUNTY, CITY OF VERNON WHO HAVE AGREED TO
- 10 COME DOWN ON FLEX DAYS. MANY OF THEM DON'T WORK A
- 11 FIVE-DAY WEEK. THEY'RE WORKING FLEX DAYS, WHETHER
- 12 THEY HAVE FRIDAYS OR MONDAYS OFF. SO THEY HAVE
- 13 COMMITTED TO THOSE.
- 14 WHAT ASSURANCE DO I HAVE? I CAN JUST
- 15 TELL YOU THAT I THINK THEY HAVE AN INCENTIVE TO
- 16 WANT TO COME DOWN. WE HAVE A VERY COMPETITIVE PAY
- 17 RATE THAT WE'RE PAYING THEM, AND I THINK THEY SEE
- THIS AS A CHALLENGE, AND WOULD LIKE TO HELP THE
- 19 CITY.
- 20 MEMBER RELIS: WELL, MR. CHAIR, THIS IS
- 21 JUST A COMMENT. CERTAINLY I'M NOT ASKING YOU, MR.
- 22 CAREY, TO COMMENT ON THIS. BUT IT IS INTERESTING
- 23 TO THINK THAT HERE WE HAVE A CASE WHERE WE'RE

- 24 TALKING ABOUT A TRANSITION. THAT'S REALLY WHAT
- THIS IS ABOUT. THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO WANTS TO

STAFF UP AND DO THIS IN A FULL BORE WAY. AND I UNDERSTAND THAT THE OPTION WAS PRESENTED TO THEM 2 THAT THE BOARD, YOU KNOW, IN A BACKUP ROLE, THIS IS 3 THE KIND OF THING WE WOULD STEP IN AND FULFILL IN THE ABSENCE OF A -- I'M JUST CURIOUS WHY, AND I'M 5 6 NOT ASKING FOR YOUR RESPONSE BECAUSE IT MIGHT BE DIFFICULT FOR YOU TO DO THAT, BUT WHY THAT WOULDN'T 7 8 HAVE BEEN THE TRANSITION OPTION UNTIL YOU HAD YOUR 9 TEAM IN PLACE. MR. CAREY: CAN I COMMENT TOO? ACTUALLY 10 11 WHAT WE PURSUED INITIALLY WAS THE CONTRACT WITH THE CITY OR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, THE DEPARTMENT OF 12 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES. AND WE HAD ENTERED 13 14 INTO NEGOTIATIONS WITH THEM DURING THIS WHOLE PROCESS; AND AS MARY COYLE HAS POINTED OUT, OUR EPP 15 HAD TO BE SUBMITTED ON OCTOBER 15TH. ON OCTOBER 16 16TH THE COUNTY FINALLY GOT BACK TO US AND TOLD US 17 THAT THEY WEREN'T IN A POSITION TO CONTRACT WITH 18 US. 19 SO WE WERE GOING UNDER THE 20 ASSUMPTION, WHAT WE FELT WAS THE ASSUMPTION, THAT 21 THEY WERE GOING TO BE ABLE TO WORK WITH US DURING 22

THIS TRANSITION PERIOD. WE HAD OFFERED THE

- 24 CONTRACT WITH THEM ALL THE WAY TO THE NEXT FISCAL
- 25 YEAR SO AS NOT TO DISRUPT THEIR FINANCIAL --

OPERATOR'S FINANCIAL SHARING OF THE WAY THE FEES 1 WOULD HAVE TO BE STRUCTURED. AND THEY SAID, "WELL, 2 WE DON'T THINK WE CAN DO THAT, BUT MAYBE WE CAN DO 3 IT TO THE FIRST OF THE YEAR." SO WE WERE GOING UNDER THAT ASSUMPTION, AND THAT DIDN'T PAN OUT 5 6 UNDER CIRCUMSTANCES THAT THEY CHOSE NOT TO DO. 7 BUT THAT WAS OUR FIRST OPTION, TO GO WITH THE EXISTING LEA IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY. WE HAVE 8 9 THE HIGHEST RESPECT FOR KEN CALVERT AND STAFF DOWN THERE. THAT'S WHAT WE WANTED. 10 FORTUNATELY, I WAS ABLE TO GET TWO OF 11 KEN'S STAFF TO BE ABLE TO WORK WITH US ANYWAY, NOT 12 HAVE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. THEY'VE GONE THROUGH 13 THEIR HUMAN RESOURCES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS TO MAKE 14 SURE THAT THERE WASN'T A CONFLICT BY WORKING WITH 15 THE CITY DURING THIS TRANSITION PERIOD. SO I THINK 16 WE'VE COVERED THAT. 17 CERTAINLY AN OPTION THAT WE HAVE AS 18 ONE OF THE THREE OPTIONS THAT BOARD STAFF HAS 19 IDENTIFIED IS THAT IF WE WEREN'T CERTIFIED ON THE 20 FULL BOARD HEARING IN NOVEMBER, THEN AUTOMATICALLY 21 YOUR BOARD STAFF, YOUR ENFORCEMENT AGENCY ITSELF 22

WOULD BE THE ENFORCEMENT AGENCY, BUT I THINK WE

- 24 HAVE A GOOD WORKABLE PLAN, AND I THINK IT WILL BE A
- TRANSITION. IT WILL ALSO MAKE FOR A SMOOTH

- 1 TRANSITION. I THINK WE'LL HAVE PEOPLE THAT WILL BE
- 2 WORKING WITH US AND MAY END UP BEING EMPLOYED WITH
- 3 US. THAT'S WHAT WE'RE HOPING.
- 4 MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN. I DON'T
- 5 KNOW, MR. CAREY, IF YOU ARE GOING TO BE ABLE TO
- 6 ANSWER THIS QUESTION OR NOT, BUT YOU BROUGHT IT
- 7 UP. AND THE LEA IS WHO YOU -- YOUR EXISTING LEA IS
- 8 WHO THE CITY WANTED TO ORIGINALLY CONTRACT WITH.
- 9 I'M CURIOUS AS TO WHO DROVE THE IDEA WITH THE CITY
- 10 TO DECERTIFY THAT LEA?
- MR. CAREY: WELL, OBVIOUSLY WE'RE GETTING
- 12 INTO WHAT THE MOTIVE IS FOR THE CITY TO BECOME ITS
- 13 LEA. ALTHOUGH THAT'S OUTSIDE THE PURVIEW OF PRC
- 43200, I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM IN ANSWERING THAT. I
- 15 THINK THAT'S IMPORTANT. I TRIED TO TALK TO MR.
- 16 LIPSON ABOUT THAT. I'VE TALKED TO JOHN CLAY AND TO
- MR. RELIS PERSONALLY ABOUT SOME OF THE MOTIVATION
- 18 BEHIND WHY THE CITY IS GOING FORWARD WITH THIS
- 19 THING.
- 20 THE CITY, AS MR. RELIS HAS POINTED
- OUT, IS THE SEVENTH LARGEST CITY IN THE COUNTRY,
- MUCH LESS IN THE STATE. WE'RE LOOKING AT A
- 23 POPULATION OF 1.2 MILLION, WHICH REPRESENTS ABOUT

- 24 44 PERCENT OF THE REGION ITSELF, COUNTY OF SAN
- DIEGO. WE HAVE TWO OF THE THREE LARGEST LANDFILLS

- 1 WITHIN THE CITY'S JURISDICTION.
- 2 SO WHEN THE COUNTY, WHICH I THINK YOU
- 3 ARE AWARE OF, BUT FOR THE RECORD, DECIDED TO SELL
- 4 ITS ASSETS, ALL OF THEIR ASSETS, AND THEY DID THAT
- 5 FOR A NUMBER OF REASONS, BUT FOR WHATEVER REASON,
- 6 THEY HAVE DONE THAT. AND AS OF THIS LAST FRIDAY,
- 7 THAT SALE HAS BEEN CONCLUDED. THEY OBVIOUSLY WERE
- 8 THE LEAD IN THE REGION AS FAR AS SOLID WASTE
- 9 ACTIVITIES, AND THEY WERE TAKING THAT LEAD. AND
- 10 THEN WITH THE SALE, THAT LEADERSHIP ROLE HAS BEEN
- 11 DIMINISHED. AND THE CITY FELT THAT IT WAS
- 12 IMPORTANT THAT THEY STEP IN THE BREACH AND TAKE AN
- 13 ACTIVE ROLE IN THE REGIONAL SOLID WASTE ISSUES
- 14 SINCE THE CITY IS SUCH AN INTEGRAL PART OF THAT.
- SO THAT'S WHERE WE'RE BASICALLY AT.
- 16 WE'RE LOOKING AT BEING ABLE TO GOVERN OUR OWN
- 17 AFFAIRS WITHIN THE CITY, APPOINT OUR OWN HEARING
- 18 PANEL, AND HAVE OUR OWN LEA.
- 19 MEMBER JONES: ONE OF THE -- WHEN I TALKED
- 20 TO OUR STAFF, THE CITY SAID THAT THEY WANTED THEIR
- 21 OWN HEARING PANEL. AND THE STAFF SAID, "WELL, YOU
- 22 CAN DO THAT NOW." YOU KNOW, "YOU CAN HAVE YOUR OWN
- 23 HEARING PANEL, " OR THAT WAS AN OPTION THAT THEY

- 24 WOULD HAVE WORKED ON. BUT I DON'T KNOW IF THAT
- 25 EVER GOT FOLLOWED UP. MY -- INDICATIONS I GOT WAS

- 1 THAT THERE WASN'T REALLY MUCH MORE DIALOGUE ABOUT
- 2 THAT, YOU KNOW, IF THE CITY HAD ITS OWN REVIEW
- 3 PANEL.
- 4 AND MY QUESTION GOES TO I DON'T
- 5 UNDERSTAND HOW AN LEA WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE
- 6 HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE CITIZENS TAKES ON A
- 7 LEADING ROLE IN SOLID WASTE ISSUES IN A
- 8 JURISDICTION.
- 9 MR. CAREY: WELL, I THINK, AS YOU KNOW,
- 10 THIS IS AN INTEGRATED PROGRAM, AND SOLID WASTE IS
- 11 CERTAINLY THE CORNERSTONE OF ANY OF THE PROGRAMS,
- 12 BUT SO MUCH IS A LYNCHPIN WITHIN SOLID WASTE. AS
- 13 THE COUNTY PULLED OUT AND SOLD THEIR ASSETS, THEY
- 14 LOST THE FUNDING FOR THEIR HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS
- 15 WASTE PROGRAMS WHICH WERE BEING FUNDED THROUGH THE
- 16 SOLID WASTE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS.
- 17 THIS HAS BECOME A KEY REGIONAL ISSUE,
- 18 SO IT'S JUST NOT SOLID WASTE BY ITSELF. THERE WAS
- 19 THIS WHOLE DOMINO EFFECT THAT OCCURRED WITH OTHER
- 20 PROGRAMS THAT WERE DEPENDENT UPON WHAT WAS
- 21 HAPPENING IN SOLID WASTE, WHETHER IT WAS IN THE
- 22 ENFORCEMENT SIDE OR ON THE OP SIDE. SO THE COUNTY,
- 23 BY STEPPING BACK AND STEPPING OUT OF THE SOLID

- 24 WASTE BUSINESS --
- 25 MEMBER JONES: AS AN OPERATOR.

```
MR. CAREY: -- AS AN OPERATOR DEFINITELY,
 1
      HAS CAUSED A RIPPLE EFFECT THROUGHOUT MANY OF THE
 2
      CITIES. AND THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO BEING SUCH A
 3
      LARGE CITY AND WANTING TO BE ABLE TO HAVE THE
       ABILITY TO EXERCISE ITS RIGHT TO GOVERN ITSELF AND
 5
 6
      HAVE THE HEARING PANEL ACCOUNTABLE TO THE CITY
       COUNCIL RATHER THAN THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WHERE
 7
       IT IS RIGHT NOW UNDER THE LEA HAS EXERCISED THEIR
 8
 9
       RIGHT TO DEDESIGNATE THE COUNTY.
                    AND THAT'S CERTAINLY ONE MAJOR ISSUE.
10
11
       THERE'S ANOTHER WHERE WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE
       POLICY DIRECTION OF THE CITY COORDINATED, WHETHER
12
       IT'S -- THEY'RE DOING SOLID WASTE ENFORCEMENT FOR
13
14
      LITTER CONTROL IN ONE DEPARTMENT AND MAYBE
      SOMETHING ELSE SOMEWHERE ELSE. THIS WILL BE ABLE
15
       TO HAVE A COMPREHENSIVE COORDINATION OF BEING ABLE
16
       TO ENFORCE REGULATORY CONTROL IN THE CITY.
17
               MEMBER JONES: THAT'S WHERE I'M GETTING
18
       CONFUSED. IS IT THE LEA IS THE POLICEMAN BASICALLY
19
      FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION. HOW DOES THE LEA
20
      FILL THE ROLE AS A POLICY LEADER IN SOLID WASTE
21
      ISSUES THAT ARE OPERATIONAL? I DON'T UNDERSTAND
22
```

HOW AN LEA FULFILLS THAT FUNCTION.

24		MR. CAREY:	WELL,	CERTAINLY	THE	ROLE,	AS
25	WITH ANY	REGULATORY	AGENCY,	WHETHER	IT'S	A STA	ΓE

- 1 AGENCY OR A LOCAL AGENCY, HAS POLICY DIRECTION.
- 2 AND I MEAN WE'RE GOING TO ENFORCE MINIMUM STATE
- 3 STANDARDS, BUT THERE ARE CEQA REQUIREMENTS AND CUP
- 4 TERMS AND CONDITIONS WHICH IN LOCAL ORDINANCES,
- 5 WHICH ALSO CAN BE ENFORCEABLE WITHIN THE
- 6 JURISDICTION OF THE SOLID WASTE PROGRAM TO SOME
- 7 EXTENT, AT LEAST FOR THE DIRECTION. SO YOU ARE
- 8 GOING TO MOVE FORWARD IN THAT DIRECTION WITH THAT
- 9 KIND OF CONSOLIDATED, STREAMLINED, COORDINATED
- 10 EFFORTS. YOU ARE NOT GOING TO HAVE YOUR LEA
- 11 HANGING OUT HERE AND HAVING YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD
- 12 COMPLIANCE PEOPLE DOING SOMETHING COMPLETELY
- 13 INAPPROPRIATE OVER HERE WHERE THERE CAN BE SOME
- 14 COORDINATION.
- 15 MEMBER JONES: WHEN YOU SAY NEIGHBORHOOD
- 16 COMPLIANCE PEOPLE, I DON'T UNDERSTAND.
- MR. CAREY: LITTER CONTROL, FOR EXAMPLE.
- 18 MEMBER RELIS: I WAS GOING TO ASK YOU WHEN
- 19 YOU ARE DONE.
- 20 MEMBER JONES: GO AHEAD.
- 21 MEMBER RELIS: WELL, JUST I'M TRYING TO
- 22 UNDERSTAND THE DIFFERENCE OF WHAT YOU ARE SAYING
- 23 AND WHAT IS INHERENTLY THE RELATIONSHIP THAT WE

- 24 HAVE THROUGHOUT THE STATE. I MEAN WE HAD A CASE
- 25 HERE, IF YOU RECALL, WITH WEST COVINA WHERE WE HAVE

- 1 AN LEA ENFORCING A LANDFILL THAT IS UNDER A LOCAL
- 2 JURISDICTION THAT -- THAT IN THAT CASE DIDN'T
- 3 PARTICULARLY LIKE THAT LANDFILL THERE.
- 4 I MEAN I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND WHAT
- 5 FUNDAMENTALLY THE DIFFERENCE HERE. MAYBE STAFF CAN
- 6 HELP US.
- 7 MEMBER JONES: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THIS AND
- 8 WEST COVINA? PROBABLY NONE.
- 9 MEMBER RELIS: WELL, I'M NOT TRYING --
- 10 ESSENTIALLY WE HAVE THIS TYPE OF -- AND THIS IS THE
- 11 FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION ABOUT THE LEA ARM'S LENGTH
- 12 RELATIONSHIP. I GUESS THE QUESTION IS WHAT IS
- 13 DIFFERENT ABOUT -- WHAT WOULD BE DIFFERENT ABOUT
- 14 THIS RELATIONSHIP THAN WHAT WE HAVE THROUGHOUT THE
- 15 STATE?
- MS. RICE: I DON'T KNOW IF I CAN HELP.
- 17 I'LL TRY. CLEARLY, WE HAVE A SITUATION THAT'S SET
- 18 UP UNDER STATE LAW WHERE YOU HAVE LEA'S WHO ARE
- 19 ARMS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AND YOU HAVE A MIX OF
- 20 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FACILITIES. SOME OF THE PUBLIC
- 21 FACILITIES ARE ARMS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AND THAT
- 22 EXISTS IN EVERY CITY AND EVERY COUNTY VIRTUALLY.
- OF COURSE, THERE ARE SOME THAT HAVE NO PUBLIC

FACILITIES.

25 I CAN UNDERSTAND A LITTLE BIT OF WHAT

THE SPEAKER IS SAYING, THAT ANY PUBLIC AGENCY MAKES 1 SOME POLICY DECISIONS IN TERMS OF HOW THEY DO THEIR 2 BUSINESS. WE CERTAINLY DO THAT. MOST AGENCIES DO. 3 YOU LOOK AT A QUESTION AND YOU TRY TO FIGURE OUT WHAT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO. IT'S NOT ALWAYS 5 6 CLEAR FROM THE FACE OF THE STATE MINIMUM STANDARDS OR THE STRICT INTERPRETATION OF YOUR ROLE. SO THAT 7 8 KIND OF THING DOES HAPPEN ROUTINELY. 9 AND AS FAR AS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS AND THE OPERATING 10 11 UNIT AND THE LEA, I THINK IT'S INEVITABLE, AND I'M SURE WE ALL ASSUME THAT COMMUNICATION DOES GO ON 12 WITHIN LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WHEN THEY'RE REACHING 13 14 DECISIONS. THAT IS THE NATURE OF THE LAW THAT WE HAVE, AND IT IS VERY HARD TO DRAW THOSE LINES. SO 15 IT IS HARD TO RESPOND TO THOSE QUESTIONS, QUITE 16 FRANKLY. 17 MEMBER JONES: YOU KNOW, MY -- WHERE I WAS 18 GOING WITH THIS LINE WAS THAT WHEN THEY TALK ABOUT 19 INTEGRATING A PROGRAM THROUGH THE LEA, THE LEA HAS 20 ONE FUNCTION, AND THAT IS TO PROTECT THE HEALTH AND 21

SAFETY OF THE PEOPLE. AND I LOOK AT STAFF HOURS AS

BEING 3,074 STAFF HOURS REQUIRED FOR INSPECTIONS,

22

- 24 PERMITTING, AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES. AND I LOOK
- 25 AT THE PEOPLE THAT YOU HAVE HERE, THAT I'M SURE ARE

- 1 ALL VERY QUALIFIED. I HAVE NO QUESTION ABOUT THAT.
- BUT WHERE I HAVE A CONCERN, AS A
- 3 FORMER OPERATOR, IS THAT HOW DO YOU PLAN ON -- ONE
- 4 OF YOUR DUTIES IS TO BE AT HEARING PANELS, TO BE AT
- 5 LEGAL PROCEEDINGS, TO BE AT ADMINISTRATIVE
- 6 HEARINGS.
- 7 IF ME AS AN OPERATOR HAS A CITATION
- 8 BY, LET'S SAY, QUONG THAN, WHO'S GOING TO BE THERE
- 9 TWO DAYS A MONTH, AND I WANT TO GO TO A PERMIT
- 10 REVIEW, I WANT TO GO TO AN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING,
- OR MY LOCAL OR MY PANEL, DO I GET TO GO AT A DATE
- 12 CERTAIN, OR DO I GET TO GO WHEN MR. OR MS. THAN IS
- 13 AVAILABLE?
- MR. CAREY: THAT'S AN EXCELLENT QUESTION,
- 15 AND I APPRECIATE WHERE YOU ARE COMING FROM WITH
- 16 IT. WHAT MY PLAN OF ATTACK ON THIS PARTICULAR
- 17 ISSUE IS ON ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS, I WILL BE THE KEY
- 18 PERSON, AND I WILL BE THE PERSON REPRESENTING. IF
- 19 THE INDIVIDUAL FINDS A CONDITION ON A FACILITY THAT
- 20 HAS TO BE PURSUED INTO A FULL ENFORCEMENT ACTION, I
- 21 WILL BE THE PERSON THAT WILL BE THE FULL-TIME
- 22 PERSON OR THE CIVIL ENGINEER WHO WILL HAVE THOSE
- 23 INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT DUTIES ALSO.

24			so	WE WILI	L HAV	E I	LOGIST	ΓΙC	AL ABILI'	TY :	ГО
25	HAVE	THAT	HEARING	PANEL	SET	AS	SOON	AS	POSSIBL	E, 2	AS

- 1 SOON AS THE MEMBERS CAN MEET AND HAVE THAT THING
- 2 HEARD, WITH OR WITHOUT THAT INITIAL INSPECTOR WHO
- 3 MIGHT HAVE NOTED THAT VIOLATION.
- 4 MEMBER JONES: IF THE INITIAL INSPECTOR
- 5 THAT NOTED THE VIOLATION AND IT IS THAT
- 6 INTERPRETATION OF VIOLATION THAT IS IN CONTENTION,
- 7 YOU ARE GOING TO ASSUME THAT ROLE OF INTERPRETING
- 8 WHAT HE OR SHE WROTE DOWN?
- 9 MR. CAREY: I THINK WE DO THAT ANYWAY
- 10 INHERENTLY; BUT IF THE PERSON IS NOT AVAILABLE, IF
- 11 THE CONDITION HAS NOT BEEN CORRECTED, STAFF THAT IS
- 12 AVAILABLE WILL MAKE SURE THAT THEY CITE IT AND SEE
- 13 IT THEMSELVES SO THEY CAN BRING THAT FORWARD
- 14 THROUGH THE HEARING PANEL PROCESS OR ENFORCEMENT
- 15 ACTION. IT WOULDN'T BE SOMETHING -- IF IT'S
- 16 CORRECTED, THAT'S WHAT WE WANT. IF IT'S NOT
- 17 CORRECTED, WE WOULD HAVE STAFF THERE.
- 18 AND I THINK IN ANY GOOD ENFORCEMENT
- 19 ACTIVITY, YOU DO THAT JUST BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL
- 20 ANYWAY WHETHER YOU NOTED THE VIOLATION 30 DAYS AGO.
- 21 YOU'RE ABOUT TO GO TO A HEARING PANEL, YOU BETTER
- 22 HAVE BEEN OUT THERE THE DAY BEFORE TO ENSURE THAT
- 23 THAT CONDITION STILL EXISTS.

24 MEMBER JONES: WHAT IF AS AN OPERATOR I
25 PUT A PERMIT PACKAGE THROUGH, AND I MEAN WE'VE GOT

```
A TOTAL OF SOMEWHERE BETWEEN 32 AND 36 DAYS A
       MONTH, WHICH IS PLENTY, BUT HAVING TAKEN -- ONE
 2
       PERMIT TOOK ME FIVE AND A HALF YEARS TO GET BECAUSE
 3
       I HAD A ROTATING STAFF THAT I GOT TO DEAL WITH ALL
       THE TIME. WHAT IS THAT GOING TO DO TO PERMIT
 5
 6
       APPLICANTS THAT ARE GOING TO COME THROUGH THIS
       SYSTEM AS FAR AS HAVING SOMEBODY AVAILABLE TO WALK
 7
       IT THROUGH CEQA, WALK IT THROUGH THE LOCAL THINGS,
 8
 9
       DEAL WITH ALL THE, YOU KNOW, DEAL WITH THE
       PAPERWORK, HOW IS THAT GOING TO BE HANDLED?
10
               MR. CAREY: I WOULD SEE THAT MY CIVIL
11
       ENGINEER, WHO HAS SOLID WASTE EXPERIENCE, WOULD BE
12
       PROBABLY THE KEY PERSON BECAUSE THAT PERSON IS A
13
14
       FULL-TIME PERSON ON THE STAFF AS WELL AS MYSELF.
       IF YOU LOOK AT THAT TIME TASK ANALYSIS, YOU ARE
15
       LOOKING AT A LOT OF THOSE PERMITTING RESPONSI-
16
       BILITIES ARE WEIGHTED HEAVILY TOWARDS THE SENIOR
17
       INDIVIDUALS IN THE DEPARTMENT ANYWAY, THE PROGRAM
18
       MANAGER OR THE CIVIL ENGINEER. SO I WOULD SEE THAT
19
       AS BEING THE KEY PERSON THAT WOULD BE DRIVING ANY
20
       PERMIT, PERMIT REVISIONS THROUGH.
21
              MEMBER JONES: THE -- I FULLY UNDERSTAND
22
```

THE LAW AND -- DON'T FULLY UNDERSTAND, BUT I

- 24 UNDERSTAND THAT THE CITY HAS THE RIGHT TO DO THIS.
- 25 I WORRY BECAUSE OF A COUPLE OF THINGS. AND ONE OF

- THEM IS THAT AT THE CITY COMMITTEE HEARING, THE SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE HEARING OR WHATEVER, THE CITY 2
- COUNCIL MEMBERS SAID AND THE CITY MANAGER SAID 3
- THINGS LIKE, "WE HAVE TO PROTECT OUR CITY. WE NEED
- TO BE THE LEA." I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW THE CITY 5
- 6 PROTECTS ITSELF FROM A PRIVATE OPERATOR BY BEING
- 7 THE LEA.

- 8 YOU KNOW, I JUST -- I CAN'T -- I CAN
- 9 IMAGINE HOW THEY CAN DO THAT. I CAN'T BASE MY
- DECISION ON THAT, BUT I UNDERSTAND HOW AB 59 WORKS, 10
- AND I UNDERSTAND WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU HAVE 11
- REPEATED VIOLATIONS AND THOSE TYPES OF THINGS. 12
- BUT I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW THE CITY 13
- 14 COUNCIL MEMBERS SAY THAT THEY AND THE CITY MANAGER
- SAYS THAT THIS IS A GOOD LEA. THIS IS A HIGHLY 15
- RESPECTED LEA, BUT THEY SOLD THEIR SYSTEM AND WE 16
- HAVE TO PROTECT OURSELVES, SO WE'RE GOING TO BE THE 17
- LEA. I'M HAVING TROUBLE WITH UNDERSTANDING WHAT 18
- MECHANISMS CAN BE, YOU KNOW, CAN BE PUT FORWARD AS 19
- THE LEA THAT CAN PROTECT THE CITY UNLESS IT'S FINES 20
- AND CITATIONS TO THE COMPETITION. 21
- MR. CAREY: WELL, AS THE PROGRAM MANAGER 22
- OF THE LEA, I CAN JUST TELL YOU, AND I CAN'T 23

- JUSTIFY WHAT WAS SAID BY THE CITY COUNCIL OR BY
- 25 PREVIOUS CITY MANAGER WHO, AS HAS BEEN REPRESENTED,

- 1 HAS LEFT, AND THAT'S TRUE, MR. MCGRORY HAS LEFT THE
- 2 COUNTY, AND WE JUST THIS LAST WEEK HAVE GOTTEN A
- 3 NEW CITY MANAGER FROM HUNTINGTON BEACH. SO I CAN'T
- 4 ADDRESS EXACTLY WHAT THEY SAID. I WASN'T AT THAT
- 5 CITY COUNCIL MEETING MYSELF WHEN THAT RESOLUTION
- 6 WAS PASSED.
- 7 I CAN ASSURE YOU AS PROGRAM MANAGER
- 8 OF THE LEA THAT I CAN TELL YOU THAT WHETHER YOU ARE
- 9 A PRIVATE OPERATOR OR IF YOU ARE PUBLIC FACILITY,
- 10 YOU ARE GOING TO BE TREATED THE SAME, EQUALLY,
- 11 UNIFORMLY, CONSISTENTLY. AND THAT'S ALL I CAN
- 12 ASSURE YOU, THE BOARD, THE BOARD STAFF. AND I
- 13 THINK THAT'S WHAT YOU HAVE TO COME AWAY WITH IS
- 14 THAT ASSURANCE THAT MYSELF, MY REPUTATION, THAT I'M
- NOT GOING TO LEAD THE CITY DOWN SOME PATH THAT IS
- 16 INAPPROPRIATE.
- 17 AND WE'RE GOING TO HIRE -- I'VE TAKEN
- 18 MYSELF OUT, AND I CAN STAND UP AND PREACH BECAUSE
- 19 I'VE TAKEN MYSELF OUT OF CONSIDERATION AS PROGRAM
- 20 MANAGER FOR THE LEA. I WANT A HIGHLY QUALIFIED --
- 21 NOT THAT I'M NOT, BUT I WANT A HIGHLY QUALIFIED
- 22 PERSON. I'D LIKE TO BE PART OF THAT SELECTION
- 23 COMMITTEE, AND I CAN GUARANTEE YOU THAT, BECAUSE OF

- 24 WHAT I HAVE HELPED CREATE, AND LISA WOOD AND MR.
- 25 HEAP ARE HERE TOO REPRESENTING THE CITY, THAT GERM

```
THAT WAS GERMINATED AND SPREAD FROM CERTAINLY THE
 1
       OPERATIONS SIDE OF THIS, AND THAT'S ANOTHER ISSUE
 2
       THAT I KNOW THAT'S SORT OF UNDERLYING, WHERE IS ALL
 3
       THIS COMING FROM? WELL, SOMEWHERE THE SEED HAS TO
       BE PLANTED, AND WHERE ELSE BETTER FROM SOMEONE WHO
 5
 6
       HAS THE ABILITY AND KNOWLEDGE OF SOLID WASTE.
 7
                    AND MR. HAYES, WHO'S THE DIRECTOR OF
 8
       ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES AND HEAD OF OPERATIONS
 9
       DEPARTMENT, COULDN'T BE A FINER INDIVIDUAL AND A
10
       MORE UPRIGHT AND HONEST AND INTEGRIBLE PERSON. I
11
       WOULD JUST SAY THAT YOU WILL HAVE TO JUST TRUST ME,
       MR. JONES, THAT I WILL ASSURE YOU THAT WHETHER YOU
12
       ARE A PRIVATE OPERATOR OR YOU'RE A PUBLIC FACILITY,
13
14
       YOU'RE GOING TO BE TREATED THE SAME IN THE CITY OF
       SAN DIEGO.
15
                MEMBER JONES: YOUR INTEGRITY IS NOT IN
16
       QUESTION BY ME. THIS IS AN ISSUE THAT I DON'T EVEN
17
       THINK THAT MY INDUSTRY WANTS ME TO GET INVOLVED IN
18
       OR THAT ANYBODY WANTS ME TO GET INVOLVED IN, BUT
19
       IT'S BEEN AN ISSUE THAT HAS ALWAYS BOTHERED ME,
20
       OKAY, FOREVER. AND IT BOTHERS ME WHEN A CITY
21
22
       COUNCIL THINKS THAT THE LEA CAN BE A TOOL TO
```

EQUALIZE RATES.

23

24 AND ONE OF THE -- I THINK MS. KETO OR 25 MS. KETO OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, CITY COUNCILPERSON

```
MUST STAY IN PUBLIC HANDS. THE LAST THING WE WANT
 2
       IS A LANDFILL TO BE TURNED OVER TO A PRIVATE
 3
       COMPANY BEHOLDEN ONLY TO THEIR STOCKHOLDERS. WE'D
       BE AT THE MERCY OF A PRIVATE COMPANY. THEY COULD
 5
 6
       TAKE THE TRASH MARKET OUT OF MIRAMAR, WHICH WOULD
      MESS UP OUR LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS. THIS COULD BE A
 7
 8
       VERY SERIOUSLY DAMAGING CONDITION FOR THE CITIZENS
 9
       OF SAN DIEGO.
                    I AGREE THAT HER CONCERNS ARE
10
11
       PROBABLY VALID, OKAY, NOT VALID, BUT I MEAN SHE'S
       AN ELECTED OFFICIAL. SHE'S WORRIED ABOUT HER
12
      CONSTITUENCY. BUT I'M WONDERING HOW DO PEOPLE
13
14
       WOULDN'T GO TO MIRAMAR WOULD GO TO SYCAMORE. WOULD
       THEY GO BECAUSE THE RATE WOULD BE LOWER? WHAT'S
15
       THE IMPACT ON THE RATEPAYER IF THE RATE IS LOWER?
16
                    TO ME, IF THE RATE'S LOWER, THEIR
17
       RATES GO DOWN. SO, YOU KNOW, WHEN I HEAR SOMETHING
18
       LIKE THAT, WHEN I HEAR SOMETHING LIKE THAT ON A
19
       TAPE, AND THEN I HEAR THAT THERE IS THIS LINK
20
       BETWEEN THE LEA ACTIVITIES AND THE CITY MANAGER'S
21
```

OFFICE, OKAY, THAT IN THE OPERATIONAL OR

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART, YOU ARE GOING TO ANSWER THE

22

23

ON THAT COMMITTEE, KEOGH, SAID, YOU KNOW, SYCAMORE

- 24 DEPARTMENT OF SERVICES DEPARTMENT, MS. TINA
- 25 CHRISTIANSON, BUT ALSO TO THE CITY MANAGER, WHO IS

- 1 THE SAME PERSON THAT THE SOLID WASTE DEPARTMENT
- 2 GOES TO. AND BELIEVE ME, THAT HAPPENS. THAT
- 3 HAPPENS ALL THE TIME. BUT YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT I'M
- 4 SAYING? I'M LOOKING AT A STAFFING REQUIREMENT
- 5 HERE. I'M LOOKING AT STAFF THAT'S NOT GOING TO BE
- 6 AROUND. THEY'RE MOONLIGHTING. I'M LOOKING AT
- 7 RATES THAT IN THE -- THE THING SAID THE RATES ARE
- 8 GOING TO GO UP FOR INSPECTIONS WHERE THEY'RE NOT --
- 9 YOU KNOW, THEY STAY THE SAME NOW, I THINK, BECAUSE
- 10 THERE IS A -- THERE'S -- YOU ARE SPREADING IT OUT
- OVER THE WHOLE COUNTY. SO WHEN YOU GO TO ONE CITY,
- 12 OBVIOUSLY THERE'S MORE -- YOU KNOW, YOU DON'T GET
- 13 THAT ECONOMIES OF SCALE. SO THE COST IS GOING TO
- 14 GO UP.
- 15 AND THEN I HEAR COUNCIL PEOPLE SAYING
- 16 WE GOT TO PROTECT OURSELVES. WE CAN'T LET THIS
- 17 HAPPEN. WE'RE GOING TO BE THE LEA. WE'RE GOING TO
- 18 PROTECT OURSELVES. TELL ME WHAT CONCLUSION. YOU
- 19 KNOW WHAT I'M SAYING?
- 20 MR. CAREY: MR. FRAZEE WAS A CITY COUNCIL
- 21 MEMBER AND THE MAYOR OF A SMALL CITY IN SAN DIEGO
- 22 COUNTY AT ONE TIME, AND YOU CAN'T CONTROL WHAT CITY
- 23 ELECTED OFFICIALS SAY. YOU CAN'T STAND UP THERE

24 AND TELL YOU.

25 MEMBER JONES: I UNDERSTAND, BUT AT THE

- 1 SAME TIME THEY THANK THE STAFF. AND I THINK RICH
- 2 HAYES AND EPPLER ARE GOOD PEOPLE. BELIEVE ME, I'M
- 3 NOT LOOKING AT THIS FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.
- 4 OKAY. I MEAN I AM, BUT THIS HAS GOT A STATEWIDE
- 5 EFFECT. THIS IS A HUGE ISSUE WHEN THE CITY SAYS
- 6 COUNTY'S A GREAT LEA. COUNTY IS ABSOLUTELY A
- 7 WONDERFUL LEA. WE WANT TO BE IN CONTROL. WE WANT
- 8 OUR OWN HEARING PANEL. STAFF SAYS YOU CAN HAVE
- 9 YOUR OWN HEARING PANEL. WE'RE GOING TO DECERTIFY,
- 10 WE'RE GOING TO COME UP WITH A CONSULTANT AND
- 11 PART-TIME MOONLIGHTERS TO FILL A FUNCTION. YOU
- 12 KNOW, YOU GOT TO KIND OF -- I WORRY ABOUT A POLICY
- 13 THAT WE'RE SETTING --
- MR. CAREY: I PROBABLY HAVE THE MOST
- 15 QUALIFIED STAFF WORKING FOR ME ON A SHORT-TERM
- 16 BASIS THAN ANYBODY ELSE IN THE STATE. I PICKED
- 17 INDIVIDUALS FROM THOSE JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE OVER
- 18 50 YEARS SOLID WASTE EXPERIENCE. SO I THINK --
- 19 LOOK AT IT FROM MY PERSPECTIVE. I SURROUNDED
- 20 MYSELF WITH EXPERTS THAT HAVE, YOU KNOW, THE MOST
- 21 CURRENT KNOWLEDGE; AND AS AN ADMINISTRATOR, I'M
- 22 GOING TO BE ABLE TO HAVE FULL UTILIZATION OF THOSE
- 23 PEOPLE WHETHER I'M USING INSPECTIONS, PERMITTING,

- OR ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY. SO I FEEL LIKE I'M AT THE
- OTHER END OF THE SPECTRUM WHERE I HAVE THE BEST OF

- 1 ALL WORLDS FOR A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME TILL WE HAVE
- OUR OWN FULL-TIME STAFF ON BOARD.
- 3 ALL I CAN DO IS REITERATE THAT, YOU
- 4 KNOW, THERE WILL BE EQUAL TREATMENT. YOU KNOW, THE
- 5 MARKET -- I'M NOT WORRIED ABOUT WHERE THE MARKET
- 6 GOES, WHETHER, YOU KNOW, THE PRIVATE OPERATOR
- 7 REDUCES THE TIPPING FEES DOWN TO WHERE THEY'RE
- 8 ATTRACTING. THAT'S NOT -- I'M NOT WORRIED ABOUT
- 9 THAT. I'M GOING TO STAND TOE TO TOE WITH THE RICH
- 10 HAYES AND BOB EPPLERS OF THE WORLD, AND WHOEVER WE
- 11 HIRE TO REPLACE ME IS GOING TO BE ABLE TO HAVE THAT
- 12 SAME ABILITY TO DO THAT. SO I CAN JUST ASSURE
- 13 YOU --
- 14 MEMBER JONES: I DON'T CARE WHERE THE
- 15 GARBAGE GOES EITHER, BELIEVE ME. THIS IS A
- 16 DIFFERENT ISSUE FOR ME.
- 17 TWO REAL QUICK QUESTIONS BEFORE I'M
- 18 DONE. WHO INSPECTS THE RESTAURANTS IN THE CITY OF
- 19 SAN DIEGO?
- 20 MR. CAREY: COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT,
- 21 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.
- 22 MEMBER JONES: AND THE PUBLIC SWIMMING
- POOLS?

MR. CAREY: SAME THING.

25 MEMBER JONES: SO ALL -- THE ONLY FUNCTION

- 1 IS GOING TO BE TO OVERSEE THE GARBAGE?
- 2 MR. CAREY: WELL, IF YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT
- 3 ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINES, THERE'S HOUSING AND THE
- 4 CITY OF SAN DIEGO DOES THEIR OWN HOUSING.
- 5 MEMBER JONES: ALL RIGHT. THANKS.
- 6 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: MY TURN.
- 7 MEMBER JONES: THANKS FOR BEING PATIENT
- 8 WITH ME, MR. CHAIRMAN. I APPRECIATE IT.
- 9 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AS I UNDERSTAND THE
- 10 STATUTE, ONE OF THE KEY CORNERSTONES IS THIS
- 11 SEPARATION OF THE LEA FACILITY FROM THE OPERATIONAL
- 12 SIDE. AND THAT IS THE BASIS OF MY CONCERN ON THIS
- 13 WHOLE PROPOSAL. AND I FULLY UNDERSTAND THAT THE
- 14 CITY OF SAN DIEGO HAS COMPLIED WITH THE LAW. THE
- 15 STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS TO GRANT THIS AUTHORITY,
- 16 BUT I'M STILL TROUBLED. AND I THINK YOU, MR.
- 17 CAREY, ADDED TO MY TROUBLE.
- AND, WELL, FIRST OF ALL, YOUR
- 19 STATEMENT THAT THE COUNTY NOW DOESN'T HAVE ANY
- 20 OPERATIONAL ROLE IN SOLID WASTE FACILITIES,
- 21 THEREFORE, THEIR LEA SHOULDN'T PERFORM IN THAT
- 22 AREA. AND I THINK THAT -- THEREIN LIES THE IDEAL
- 23 SITUATION. IF YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TRUE

- 24 SEPARATION, YOU HAVE A COUNTY STAFF WHICH HAS NO
- 25 OPERATIONAL FACILITIES OR OPERATIONAL CAPABILITIES

WITHIN THE COUNTY AT ALL, AND SO THAT MEETS THE 1 TRUE TEST OF THE SPIRIT OF THE STATUTE, ANYWAY. 2 AND MY MAJOR CONCERN ALL ALONG HAS 3 BEEN, I THINK, SOMEWHAT MISTAKEN VIEW BY CITY OF SAN DIEGO PEOPLE THAT BY BEING THEIR OWN LEA, 5 6 THEY'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO ENFORCE THINGS OTHER THAN THE STATUTE, THE WASTE STATUTES. AND YOU USED 7 THE TERM CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS AND ON AND ON, AND 8 THERE ARE SOME STATEMENTS, AND I CAN'T FIND THEM IN 9 YOUR APPLICATION, BUT STATEMENTS THAT SAY SOMETHING 10 TO THAT EFFECT, THAT THE LEA'S CAN HAVE OTHER 11 DUTIES. THEY CAN ENFORCE OTHER LAWS. 12 AND THAT IS WHAT CAUSES ME SOME 13 14 CONCERN IS KEEPING THEM ON THE STRAIGHT AND NARROW VERSUS THEM GETTING OVER INTO THE ENFORCEMENT OF 15 LAND USE. AND THAT GOES BACK ALSO TO THE QUESTION 16 OF WHERE THIS IS LOCATED. AND I DON'T KNOW WHERE 17 YOU PUT IT, BUT IN THE TABLE OF ORGANIZATION, IT'S 18 PLUGGED INTO DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES, AND LAND USE 19 OPERATIONS CONTROL ARE LOCATED IN DEVELOPMENTAL 20 SERVICES. AND I DON'T QUITE UNDERSTAND. YOU KNOW, 21 THEY HAVE TO BE SOMEWHERE, BUT THEN THERE'S THE 22 DOTTED LINE THAT HAS THEM REPORTING DIRECTLY BACK 23

- TO THE CITY MANAGER. SO I'M HAVING SOME TROUBLE
- 25 COMPREHENDING THAT WHOLE SITUATION.

```
MR. CAREY: LET ME TRY TO ANSWER THE FIRST
 1
       ISSUE THAT YOU RAISED. IF I MISSPOKE OR IF I SAID
 2
       SOMETHING THAT LED YOU TO BELIEVE THAT WE'RE NOT --
 3
      THAT WE WANT SOME SORT OF CONTROL BECAUSE THE
      COUNTY HAD SOLD THEIR SYSTEM, THAT MADE THEIR LEA
 5
 6
      NOT AS APPRECIATED OR NOT AS WELL THOUGHT OF, I
      DIDN'T MEAN TO SEND THAT INTENT AT ALL.
 7
                    I MEAN, LIKE I HAD TRIED TO SAY, WE
 8
 9
       TRIED TO CONTINUE THIS TO WORK WITH THEM AND
       CONTRACT WITH THAT LEA, BUT THEY CHOSE NOT TO WORK
10
       WITH US, AND FOR WHATEVER REASONS. I DON'T EVEN
11
      KNOW THE REASONS BEHIND IT. THEY'RE JUST
12
      CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND THEIR CONTROL, AND DANIEL
13
14
      AVERA MADE IT PERFECTLY CLEAR THAT HE WASN'T AT
      LIBERTY TO CONTINUE TO CONTRACT WITH US.
15
                     SO WE HAD TO CHOOSE OTHER OPTIONS.
16
       SO IF I SOMEHOW LED YOU TO A DIFFERENT IMPRESSION,
17
      THAT CERTAINLY IS NOT THE INTENT. BUT I WAS
18
       TALKING ABOUT MORE WHAT THE OVERALL REGIONAL SOLID
19
      WASTE PICTURE WHERE THE COUNTY HAS ALWAYS BEEN, AND
20
      YOU KNOW THROUGH SANDAG AND ORGANIZATIONS LIKE THAT
21
      THAT THE COUNTY HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE PERSON LOOKING
22
```

FOR WHERE ARE WE GOING TO PLACE THE NEXT LANDFILL.

23

- THEY'VE ALWAYS TAKEN THE LEADERSHIP ROLE ON THAT,
- 25 AND WITHOUT THE OPERATIONS SIDE ON THAT NOW. AND

WAS THE CITY INTERESTED IN BEING THE LEA FOR THE 3 WHOLE COUNTY. THAT GIVES YOU THE INTENT OF WHERE THE COUNTY MAY BE COMING FROM. 5 6 IF YOU TALK ABOUT A CITY COUNCILMEMBER MISSPEAKING, HERE'S THE CHIEF 7 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER SAYING, "DOES THE CITY WANT 8 9 TO BE THE LEA FOR THE WHOLE COUNTY?" WHERE IS THAT 10 COMING FROM? THAT LEADS ME IN MY MIND TO THINK 11 THAT THERE'S SOME OTHER INTENT. MAYBE THEY'RE NOT JUST GETTING RID OF THEIR OPERATIONS SIDE OF THIS 12 THING. 13 14 SO THAT PUT ASIDE, AS FAR AS THE SEPARATION ISSUE, THE FORMER GOVERNMENT THAT WE HAD 15 IN THE CITY IS OBVIOUSLY A CITY MANAGER TO THE 16 COUNCIL. AND INITIALLY WHEN WE DID THIS, IN 17 LOOKING AT IT IN JULY, WE SAID, "WELL, IT MAKES 18

SENSE TO PUT THIS UNDER THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

DEPARTMENT THAT'S SEPARATE AND APART. IT'S BURIED.

IT'S CERTAINLY AWAY FROM, BUT EVERYBODY, ALL THOSE

DEPARTMENTS, WHETHER YOU'RE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

OR PUBLIC WORKS, YOU ARE ALL GOING UP TO THE CITY

I'LL BE VERY BLUNT. THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE

2

19

20

21

22

23

OFFICER OF THE COUNTY STATED TO CITY DIRECTOR THAT

- 24 MANAGER AT SOME POINT. SO THE FURTHER DOWN YOU
- 25 BURY THEM. IT'S JUST LIKE THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE

- 1 OFFICER IN THE COUNTY. EVENTUALLY KEN CALVERT
- 2 GETS UP THAT HIGH. MIGHT HAVE TO GO THROUGH A
- 3 BUNCH OF LAYERS TO GET THERE, BUT THEY END UP BEING
- 4 DICTATED BY THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER.
- 5 SO WHAT WE LOOKED AT WAS DEVELOPMENT
- 6 OF SERVICES. THEN WE SAID, "WELL, WE HAVE THOSE
- 7 ISSUES. THIS IS THE SAME GROUP THAT DOES CEQA.
- 8 THIS IS THE SAME GROUP THAT MAKES LAND USE
- 9 DECISIONS. THIS IS THE SAME GROUP THAT PERMITS AND
- 10 DOES CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS. MAYBE WE NEED TO
- 11 EVEN HAVE FURTHER SEPARATION. WE CAN'T HAVE THE
- 12 SAME DEPARTMENT HEAD WEARING THE HAT SAYING, "WELL,
- 13 THE CEQA PEOPLE WIN ON THIS ONE. YOU LEA GUYS,
- 14 THIS IS GOING TO BE PART OF TERMS OR CONDITION YOU
- 15 PUT IN A PERMIT, "WHICH WE SAID, "WELL, MAYBE LET'S
- 16 EVEN GET IT FURTHER SEPARATED. WE'LL GO DIRECTLY.
- 17 THAT AUTHORITY WILL GO DIRECTLY TO THE CITY MANAGER
- AND HAVE EQUAL STATUS OF THAT DEPARTMENT HEAD
- 19 THAT'S SITTING IN ENVIRONMENTAL OR DEVELOPMENTAL
- 20 SERVICES."
- SO WHAT WE'RE DOING AND WHAT WILL
- 22 COME BACK TO THIS BOARD AT SOME POINT IN THE FUTURE
- 23 IS PROBABLY A RESOLUTION FROM COUNCIL SAYING THAT

- 24 THIS WILL BE LOCATED AND WORK DIRECTLY FOR THE CITY
- MANAGER, SO THERE WILL BE EVEN MORE AUTONOMY. I

- 1 HOPE THAT ANSWERS SOME OF YOUR CONCERNS.
- 2 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: THE -- YOU MIGHT TOUCH
- 3 ON THE ISSUE OF YOUR STATEMENT THAT THE LEA'S WOULD
- 4 BE ENFORCING CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS.
- 5 MR. CAREY: I GUESS WHAT I'M TRYING TO SAY
- 6 AND WHAT I'VE SEEN OTHER LEA'S IN THEIR EPP'S SAY
- 7 IS THAT IF THOSE TERMS AND CONDITIONS BECOME PART
- 8 OF THE PERMIT, THEN THEY HAVE AUTHORIZATION TO
- 9 ENFORCE, WHETHER IT'S A TRAFFIC, YOU KNOW, FLOW OR
- 10 SOMETHING AS LONG AS IT RELATES BACK TO CERTAINLY
- 11 THE MINIMUM STANDARDS. BUT THAT IS ALL I MEANT BY
- 12 THAT.
- 13 I MEAN MANY TIMES THE CONDITIONAL USE
- 14 PERMITS, THE CEQA REQUIREMENTS, THEY'RE ALL
- 15 INCORPORATED INTO THOSE PERMITS. AND AS SUCH THEN
- 16 THE LEA IS WEARING WHATEVER THAT ENFORCEMENT HAT IS
- 17 IS MY UNDERSTANDING.
- 18 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: I THINK, CORRECT ME IF
- 19 I'M WRONG, IN ONE OF THE MULTIPLE SAN MARCOS CASES,
- 20 THE COURT RULED THAT THE LEA DID NOT HAVE THE
- 21 AUTHORITY TO ENFORCE LAND USE ISSUES EVEN THOUGH
- THEY WERE INCORPORATED IN THE PERMIT.
- MR. CAREY: THEN I STAND CORRECTED. IF

- 24 THAT WAS A LEGAL FINDING THAT THEY FOUND, I DON'T
- 25 KNOW IF IT HAD ANY -- IF IT MADE A DIFFERENCE THAT

```
THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS WAS TRYING TO DO THE
       ENFORCEMENT THEMSELVES OUTSIDE THE COUNTY. THIS
 2
       PARTICULAR CASE WILL BE THE SAME JURISDICTION AS
 3
       THE CITY ITSELF. I DON'T KNOW IF THAT MAKES ANY
       DIFFERENCE OR NOT. I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH THAT
 5
 6
       RULING.
                    WE'RE NOT GOING TO DO SOMETHING
 7
 8
       THAT'S OBVIOUSLY ILLEGAL AND THAT WE DON'T HAVE THE
       AUTHORITY TO DO. AND I'M SURE THE OPERATOR,
 9
       WHETHER PUBLIC OR PRIVATE, WILL CHALLENGE US
10
11
       IMMEDIATELY ON THAT IF WE'RE TRYING TO DO SOMETHING
       THAT'S OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF OUR AUTHORITY. AND I
12
       WOULD LOOK TO THE DIRECTION OF YOUR BOARD STAFF TO
13
14
      HELP ME ON THAT. I PLAN PERSONALLY, ALONG WITH THE
       CIVIL ENGINEER, TO BE ATTENDING THE MOST RECENT
15
       TRAINING THAT'S GOING TO BE PROVIDED TO US AND
16
       THROUGH THE BOARD IN ASILIMAR NEXT WEEK. SO I'M
17
       HOPING TO HIT THE GROUND RUNNING AND BE ABLE TO
18
       PROTECT THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY AS YOU WANT.
19
               CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: YOU HAVE ANYTHING?
20
               MEMBER RELIS: I'LL HAVE SOME COMMENTS.
21
              CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: WE HAVE MR. HEAP AND MS.
22
```

WOOD FROM THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO THAT MAY WISH TO

23

- 24 ADDRESS US TOO.
- MR. CAREY: I DIDN'T GET AN OPPORTUNITY

- 1 WHEN I FIRST WALKED UP HERE. I JUST WANTED TO
- 2 PUBLICLY THANK YOUR BOARD STAFF FOR THE MANNER --
- 3 THE WAY THEY HANDLED THIS, THIS VERY SHORT NOTICE,
- 4 EVERYONE FROM MISS RICE TO MR. UNSELL TO MARY COYLE
- 5 AND CHRISTINE MCCRACKEN HAVE BEEN VERY HELPFUL IN
- 6 EXPEDITING THIS PROCESS FOR US AND WE APPRECIATE
- 7 THAT. AND WE CERTAINLY CONCUR WITH THE STAFF
- 8 RECOMMENDATION. THANK YOU.
- 9 MR. HEAP: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. MY
- NAME IS ELMER HEAP. I'M IN THE CITY ATTORNEY'S
- 11 OFFICE IN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. I JUST WANTED TO
- 12 MAKE TWO POINTS IF I COULD, AS I HEARD SOME OF THE
- 13 QUESTIONS THAT WERE ASKED THIS MORNING.
- 14 THE FIRST IS AS IT RELATES TO OUR
- 15 OFFICE AND WHAT WE PLAN TO DO IN PROVIDING LEGAL
- ADVICE TO THE LEA. WE MET LAST MONDAY, OCTOBER
- 17 27TH, WITH TOM MONTGOMERY FROM COUNTY COUNSEL, WHO,
- AS YOU KNOW, PROVIDES LEGAL ADVICE TO THE LEA AT
- 19 THE PRESENT TIME. AND ALONG WITH ME WAS THE
- 20 ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY AND TWO ATTORNEYS IN OUR
- 21 OFFICE THAT ARE IN THE ENFORCEMENT AREA OF OUR
- OFFICE.
- 23 AND OUR OFFICE AT THE PRESENT TIME IS

- 24 DETERMINING EXACTLY WHERE THE INDIVIDUAL WHO WILL
- 25 PROVIDE THESE LEGAL ADVICE TO THE LEA, WHERE THAT

- 1 INDIVIDUAL WILL BE LOCATED IN THE OFFICE. AND
- 2 CLEARLY IT WON'T BE ME. I'M PRESENTLY ONE OF THE
- 3 LEGAL -- WELL, I'M THE LEGAL ADVISOR TO THE
- 4 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT. AND WE KNOW
- 5 THAT IT CAN'T BE ME. SO OUR OFFICE IS PREPARED
- 6 RIGHT NOW TO DETERMINE WHO WOULD BEST HANDLE
- 7 PROVIDING LEGAL ADVICE TO THE LEA. NOT ONLY IS IT
- 8 NOT GOING TO ME, IT'S NOT EVEN GOING TO BE ANYBODY
- 9 WITHIN THE DIVISION THAT I WORK IN WITHIN THE
- 10 OFFICE.
- 11 AS MANY OF YOU KNOW ALREADY, THE CITY
- 12 ATTORNEY WITHIN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO IS AN ELECTED
- 13 OFFICIAL AND IS INDEPENDENT FROM THE CITY COUNCIL
- 14 AND THE CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE.
- 15 THE SECOND POINT, I HOPE, SHEDS MAYBE
- 16 SOME LIGHT. I'M NOT HERE TO TRY TO JUSTIFY SOME OF
- 17 THE COMMENTS MADE BY THE CITY COUNCIL AND BY THE
- 18 MAYOR AND BY THE CITY MANAGER. ONE THING NEEDS TO
- 19 BE NOTED, AND I KNOW BASED UPON YOUR QUESTIONS,
- 20 THAT YOU'VE CAREFULLY REVIEWED THE RECORD. NOT
- 21 ONLY WAS THE ISSUE OF THE LEA IN FRONT OF THE CITY
- 22 COUNCIL, IN FRONT OF THE NRC COMMITTEE THAT WAS
- 23 REFERRED TO, BUT ALSO THERE WAS AN ISSUE IN FRONT

- OF THE CITY COUNCIL THAT RELATED TO AN ORDINANCE,
- 25 SOLID WASTE FACILITY ORDINANCE, THAT WE ASKED THE

1

23

AUTHORITY AS IT RELATES TO REGULATING THOSE 2 OPERATING SOLID WASTE FACILITIES WITHIN THE CITY OF 3 SAN DIEGO, THAT PRIOR TO THEM OPERATING THE FACILITY WITHIN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, THEY WOULD 5 6 NEED TO OBTAIN A FRANCHISE OR SOME TYPE OF AN AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. 7 SO THOSE ISSUES WERE BEING TALKED 8 9 ABOUT AT THE SAME TIME ALONG WITH THIS LEA ISSUE. IN ADDITION, THERE WERE ISSUES TALKED ABOUT AS IT 10 11 RELATES TO THE CUP AND THE COUNTY'S COMPLIANCE WITH THE CUP AND TO CAREFULLY REVIEW THE CUP TO 12 DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THE COUNTY WAS COMPLYING 13 14 WITH THE CUP AS IT RELATES TO OPERATING SYCAMORE CANYON LANDFILL. 15 SO SOME OF THE COMMENTS THAT WERE 16 MADE MAY HAVE BEEN IN RELIANCE UPON SOME OF THE 17 OTHER ISSUES THAT WERE TALKED ABOUT AT THE 18 COMMITTEE MEETING AND AT THE CITY COUNCIL, AND 19 PERHAPS THEY WERE THINKING ABOUT SOME OF THE ISSUES 20 THAT WERE RAISED AS IT RELATES TO THE SOLID WASTE 21 FACILITY ORDINANCE AND SOME OF THE CONTROLS THAT 22

THE CITY WOULD HAVE IN EXERCISING ITS POLICE POWERS

COUNCIL PASS THAT WOULD GIVE THE CITY COUNCIL SOME

- 24 IN THAT MANNER. SO I JUST WANTED TO MAKE THOSE TWO
- 25 COMMENTS AT THIS TIME.

```
MEMBER JONES: THAT WAS WHAT GOT MY
 1
       ATTENTION WAS THE FACT THAT I DIDN'T CARE ABOUT THE
 2
       FRANCHISE AGREEMENT. I THINK THAT'S REASONABLE. I
 3
       THINK THAT THE CUP, THAT'S WITHIN THE CITY'S
       JURISDICTION. BUT WHEN YOU PUT ALL THREE OF THEM
 5
       TOGETHER AS POLICE ACTIONS TO CONTROL YOUR DESTINY,
 6
       THAT GETS VERY WORRISOME TO ME.
 7
                     I MEAN THAT'S ACTUALLY WHAT CREATED
 8
 9
       THE BIGGEST PART OF THE PROBLEM FOR ME WAS THAT,
10
       OKAY, GOT AN ORDINANCE WHICH IS GOING TO BE ABLE TO
11
       SET DOWN STANDARDS FOR -- CITY STANDARDS ON HOW
       THESE PEOPLE ARE GOING TO OPERATE. YOU ARE GOING
12
       TO DEAL WITH CUP'S, THAT'S GOING TO DEAL WITH THE
13
14
      LAND ISSUES, THAT'S GOING TO DEAL WITH THE TRAFFIC,
       BUT YOU INCLUDE LEA ACTIVITY. YOU KNOW WHAT I'M
15
       SAYING? THAT'S WHAT REALLY TRIGGERED WHY ARE WE
16
       DOING THIS? YOU KNOW, WHY ARE WE SO INTENT THAT AN
17
       LEA IS GOING TO BE ABLE TO CONTROL OUR DESTINY?
18
       THAT SCARES ME A LOT.
19
                     I MEAN, YOU KNOW, I THINK THAT THIS
20
       IS AN INEVITABLE, YOU KNOW, RIGHT WITHIN THE CITY
21
       THAT AT SOME POINT THEY GET THERE. I THINK WHERE
22
```

MY CONCERN IS THAT THERE'S BEEN SUCH A RUSH HERE TO

23

- 24 REACT TO THE SALE OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY SYSTEM,
- THAT SOMETIMES IN A, YOU KNOW, IN A REAL EFFORT TO

- 1 TRY TO PROTECT THE CITIZENS, MAYBE PEOPLE GO A
- 2 LITTLE BIT WHACKED AND TRY TO INCLUDE A WHOLE LOT
- 3 MORE THAT DOESN'T NEED TO BE THERE.
- 4 I WORRY -- I THINK THE STAFF THAT MR.
- 5 CAREY HAS DONE -- I MEAN I'VE CHECKED AROUND.
- 6 THESE ARE ALL GOOD LEA'S AND PEOPLE HAVE A LOT OF
- 7 RESPECT FOR, BUT I HAVE A REAL PROBLEM IF SOMEBODY
- 8 PUTS A PERMIT FORWARD AND IT TAKES A YEAR OR SIX
- 9 MONTHS OR EIGHT MONTHS BECAUSE THE PERSON WORKING
- ON THE PERMIT CAN ONLY BE THERE THREE HOURS A WEEK.
- 11 I DON'T THINK THAT'S A SERVICE THAT THE CITY
- 12 WANTS -- YOU KNOW, I DON'T THINK THAT'S THE LEVEL
- OF SERVICE THAT THE CITY WANTS TO BE ABLE TO
- 14 PROVIDE, YOU KNOW. AND HOW DO WE ENSURE THAT THAT
- DOESN'T HAPPEN, YOU KNOW, THAT THOSE ARE THE
- 16 TYPES -- YOU KNOW, OR THAT SOMEBODY HAS A HEARING
- 17 PANEL, THINGS LIKE THAT.
- 18 IT WOULD SEEM TO ME IT WOULD HAVE
- 19 BEEN, YOU KNOW, WOULD HAVE BEEN A LITTLE MORE --
- 20 WOULD HAVE BEEN NICE IF THERE WAS MORE TIME, THAT,
- 21 YOU KNOW, SOMETHING COULD HAVE BEEN REALLY LAID OUT
- 22 THAT MADE PEOPLE UNDERSTAND. I GOT VERY NERVOUS
- 23 WHEN I HEARD THAT COMMITTEE MEETING AND PEOPLE

- 24 THANKING THE SOLID WASTE DEPARTMENT FOR MAKING THEM
- 25 AWARE OF WHAT THE POTENTIAL DISASTERS COULD BE AND

- THIS AND THAT. I JUST DON'T SEE THAT AS AN LEA'S
 CHARGE. UNFORTUNATELY, WHEN THE LEA'S THINK THAT
- , ..
- 3 THAT IS THEIR CHARGE, THEN WE HAVE REAL PROBLEMS.
- 4 MR. HEAP: I CAN REPRESENT TO YOU, MR.
- 5 JONES, AND TO EACH OF YOU HERE THAT CLEARLY THE
- 6 CITY OF SAN DIEGO WILL ACT AS ITS LEA AND PERFORM
- 7 THAT FUNCTION, PERIOD. WILL NOT GO BEYOND THAT
- 8 SCOPE. OBVIOUSLY WE HAVE OTHER MECHANISMS SET UP
- 9 TO HELP US IN OTHER AREAS FOR WHICH WE'RE CONCERNED
- 10 ABOUT TO ENSURE THE PUBLIC SAFETY OF THE CITIZENS
- OF SAN DIEGO. WE WILL FUNCTION AS THE LEA AND ONLY
- 12 AS AN LEA AND MAKE SURE THAT WE DO THAT. AND OUR
- OFFICE, THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, WILL PROVIDE
- 14 THE BEST POSSIBLE LEGAL ADVICE IN ASSISTING THE LEA
- 15 IN PERFORMING ITS FUNCTION.
- 16 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: THANK YOU. LISA WOOD.
- MS. WOOD: GOOD MORNING, COMMITTEE
- 18 MEMBERS. MY NAME IS LISA WOOD. I'M FROM THE CITY
- 19 OF SAN DIEGO. I ALSO AM THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE
- 20 REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO SANDAG
- 21 SERVING AS THEIR LOCAL TASK FORCE FOR AB 939. SO I
- 22 HAVE A LITTLE BIT OF A REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON SOME
- OF THESE ISSUES.

- 24 I JUST WANTED TO MAKE A FEW COMMENTS,
- 25 AND I'LL KEEP THEM VERY BRIEF AND I'LL BE HAPPY TO

ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. 1 2 WITH REGARD TO SOME OF THE DISCUSSIONS, THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE HAS 3 BEEN VERY CONCERNED IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION, FOR EXAMPLE, ABOUT HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ISSUES. 5 6 JUST TALKING WITH YOUR LOCAL ASSISTANCE STAFF ABOUT SOME PROBLEMS THAT WE'RE HAVING IN THE REGION. 7 8 THE COUNTY HAD PREVIOUSLY FUNDED A 9 LOT OF THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAMS FOR 10 THE OTHER CITIES THROUGH THE TIPPING FEES AT THE 11 LANDFILL AND HAS RECENTLY NOTIFIED THE OTHER CITIES THAT THEY WILL NO LONGER BE PROVIDING THAT 12 FUNDING. THEY DID FINALLY, AS A LAST-MINUTE 13 14 EFFORT, AGREE TO FUND THEM THROUGH JULY 1ST, WHICH AT LEAST GIVES SOME OF THE SMALLER CITIES SOME 15 BREATHING ROOM TO FIGURE OUT HOW THEY'RE GOING TO 16 FUND THESE PROGRAMS. 17 ALSO, THE WOMAN WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE 18 FOR PROVIDING THESE PROGRAMS WITH THE COUNTY, PAM 19 JACKSON, HAS GONE TO ANOTHER PROGRAM. SO MY 20 UNDERSTANDING IS MR. CALVERT, WHO ALSO RUNS THE 21 LEA, WILL BE TAKING OVER THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS 22

WASTE PROGRAM ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY. AND HE'S

23

- 24 TRYING TO WORK THROUGH MY COMMITTEE, THE TECHNICAL
- 25 ADVISORY COMMITTEE, TO ASSIST THE OTHER CITIES IN

FIGURING OUT HOW THEY'RE GOING TO PROVIDE FUNDING AND HOW THEY'RE GOING TO PROVIDE A REGIONAL 2 HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAM. 3 SO THIS IS AN EXAMPLE OF SOME OF THE ISSUES THAT THE COUNTY AND THE CITIES WITHIN THE 5 6 COUNTY ARE DEALING WITH AS A RESULT OF THE COUNTY GETTING OUT OF THE SOLID WASTE BUSINESS? IT HAS 7 HAD AN IMPACT TO THE REGION. AND THROUGH THE 8 9 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE WE'RE TRYING TO DEAL WITH THE AB 939 ISSUES THAT RESULT FROM THAT. I 10 11 DID WANT TO MENTION THAT. I'VE WORKED QUITE A BIT WITH MR. 12 CALVERT AND HAVE INVITED HIM TO COME AND SPEAK TO 13 14 THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SOME OF THE PROJECTS THAT HE'S WORKING ON. FOR EXAMPLE, HE IS 15 WORKING WITH HIS DEPARTMENT OF LAND USE ON SOME 16 COMPOSTING REGULATIONS BECAUSE THE COMPOSTING 17 FACILITIES REALLY NEED MORE THAN JUST LAND USE 18 CONTROL. THE JURISDICTIONS HAVE LAND USE CONTROL, 19 BUT IN A LOT OF CIRCUMSTANCES YOU ACTUALLY NEED 20 SOMEBODY TO GO OUT THERE AND INSPECT THOSE 21 FACILITIES AND MAKE SURE THAT THEY AREN'T POSING A 22

THREAT TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY.

23

24 AND SO HE IS PROPOSING AN ORDINANCE
25 WHICH WOULD APPLY ONLY IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA,

- AND HE'S WORKING WITH HIS DPOU ON THE PERMITTING

 SIDE TO HELP PROVIDE THAT KIND OF REGULATION TO
- 3 ENSURE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY.
- 4 WHAT I'M DOING IN THE TECHNICAL
- 5 ADVISORY COMMITTEE IS I'M ALLOWING HIM A PLATFORM
- 6 TO EXPLAIN WHAT HE'S DOING FOR THE UNINCORPORATED
- 7 AREA SO THAT THE OTHER CITIES WITHIN THE REGION CAN
- 8 DECIDE IF THEY WANT TO PASS SIMILAR ORDINANCES THAT
- 9 WOULD HELP PROVIDE THAT KIND OF CONTROL.
- 10 IN TERMS OF SOME OF THE QUESTIONS
- 11 THAT HAVE COME UP TODAY ABOUT PROVIDING CEQA, I
- 12 USED TO BE A CEQA ANALYST FOR THE CITY OF SAN
- 13 DIEGO, AND I THINK THAT WE'RE SET UP VERY WELL TO
- 14 PROVIDE THE CEQA PORTION OF THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS
- 15 THAT WE PROVIDE WITHIN THE CITY.
- 16 IN TERMS OF MR. RELIS AND, I THINK,
- MR. JONES, AS WELL, YOU WERE CONCERNED ABOUT
- 18 GETTING STAFF HIRED RIGHT AWAY. AND I'M THE WORKER
- 19 BEE THAT'S DOING AS MUCH AS I CAN TO WORK ON THAT.
- 20 I'M TALKING WITH PEOPLE ABOUT HOW TO GO ABOUT THE
- 21 RECRUITMENT PROCESS AND GETTING AS MUCH INPUT I
- 22 CAN. MY GOAL, AS THE WORKER BEE KIND OF PERSON, IS
- TO ENSURE THAT I WORK WITH OUR PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

- 24 AND GET AS MANY HIGHLY QUALIFIED CANDIDATES AS
- 25 POSSIBLE. I'M DOING THAT AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.

- 1 I HAVE A LOT OF PRESSURE ON ME TO MAKE ALL THESE
- 2 THINGS HAPPEN VERY QUICKLY, AND I'M DOING THE BEST
- 3 THAT I CAN. SO THAT'S KIND OF AN OVERVIEW FROM MY
- 4 PERSPECTIVE. BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.
- 5 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: QUESTIONS? IF NOT,
- 6 THANK YOU.
- 7 MR. UNSELL: IF I COULD ASK ONE QUESTION,
- 8 THAT I NEEDED A LITTLE CLARIFICATION IN TERMS OF
- 9 MS. WOOD'S INVOLVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION. AND NOT
- 10 KNOWING THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE EXACTLY,
- 11 WHETHER YOU ARE WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENTAL AGENCY
- 12 THAT THE LEA IS WITH OR PART OF THE OPERATIONAL
- 13 UNIT OR HOW DOES THAT ALIGNMENT?
- 14 MS. WOOD: I AM THE ONE PERSON HERE WHO IS
- 15 FROM THE OPERATIONAL DEPARTMENT.
- 16 MEMBER JONES: FROM ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
- 17 DEPARTMENT?
- 18 MS. WOOD: FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
- 19 DEPARTMENT.
- 20 MEMBER JONES: AND YOU ARE HIRING THE LEA
- 21 STAFF?
- MS. WOOD: NO, I AM NOT HIRING THE LEA
- 23 STAFF.

- 24 MEMBER JONES: DIDN'T YOU JUST SAY YOU ARE
- THE WORKER BEE.

- 1 MS. WOOD: I'M THE WORKER BEE, HOWEVER, I
- 2 WILL NOT BE ON THE INTERVIEW PANEL. I'M WORKING
- 3 WITH PERSONNEL TO GO THROUGH OUR PERSONNEL
- 4 PROCESSES. WE HAVE -- AS YOU KNOW, THE GOVERNMENTS
- 5 ALWAYS HAVE THEIR PROCESSES. SO MY FUNCTION IS
- 6 STRICTLY TO ENSURE THAT OUR CITY PROCESSES, REO'S,
- 7 EP, ALL THAT, ARE COMPLIED WITH AS WE GO THROUGH
- 8 THE HIRING.
- 9 MEMBER JONES: ARE YOU THE HUMAN RESOURCES
- 10 PERSON FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO?
- MS. WOOD: EXCUSE ME.
- 12 MEMBER JONES: HUMAN RESOURCES, HIRING,
- 13 FIRING.
- MS. WOOD: NO, I'M NOT.
- 15 MEMBER JONES: BUT YOU ARE A MEMBER OF THE
- 16 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES THAT IS SETTING UP THE
- 17 PROCESS TO HIRE THE LEA.
- MS. WOOD: I'M DOING WORK, YES.
- 19 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I'M GOING TO
- 20 MAKE A MOTION AND LET ME JUST PREFACE IT.
- 21 MR. CHANDLER: MR. RELIS, LET ME JUST MAKE
- 22 SOME FINAL CONCLUDING REMARKS FROM STAFF'S
- 23 PERSPECTIVE BECAUSE I WANT TO SAY A FEW REMARKS

- 24 THAT, I THINK, GET TO THE VERY QUESTION YOU RAISE,
- 25 WHICH IS WHAT'S REALLY CHANGING HERE, AND THEN, OF

COURSE, ENTERTAIN THE MOTION. 1 WHAT'S REALLY DIFFERENT? AND I THINK 2 WE HAVE TO MAKE SURE WE DON'T FORGET THE FACT THAT 3 IT WASN'T TOO LONG AGO THAT THE COUNTY WAS RUNNING THESE FACILITIES WITH THE COUNTY AS THE LEA. AND, 5 6 OF COURSE, REALLY YOU ARE RIGHT, WEST COVINA NOTWITHSTANDING, THERE ISN'T A WHOLE LOT CHANGING 7 HERE. AND I THINK WHEN WE LOOKED AT THE 8 9 APPLICATION, WE FELT WE SAW A COMPLETE APPLICATION WITH THE QUALIFICATIONS. 10 11 CLEARLY I THINK THE QUESTION BEFORE THE BOARD IS, HOWEVER, DOES THE CITY GET IT, AS WE 12 SOMETIMES SAY? DOES THE CITY TRULY UNDERSTAND THE 13 14 INDEPENDENT ROLE OF THE LEA? AND I WOULD HAVE TO ADMIT THAT SOME OF THE COMMENTARY WE'VE HEARD FROM 15 CITY OFFICIALS IS THAT MAYBE THEY VIEW THE ROLE OF 16 THE LEA OR THE OFFICE OF THE LEA AS AN OFFICE THAT 17 CAN ACCOMPLISH SOME THINGS THAT WE HISTORICALLY 18 HAVE SEEN GO OUTSIDE THE TRUE RESPONSIBILITY OF OUR 19 20 CERTIFIED LEA. STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION WAS BASED ON 21 THE APPLICATION WHERE WE FELT THE I'S WERE DOTTED 22

AND THE T'S WERE CROSSED, AND OBVIOUSLY WE ARE

23

- 24 GOING TO HAVE TO RECONCILE SOME OF THE OTHER
- 25 CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU ARE ALL GRAPPLING WITH NOW

- 1 AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE CITY TRULY UNDERSTANDS
- 2 THAT INDEPENDENT ROLE THAT WE WANT THE LEA'S OFFICE
- 3 TO PLAY. ON THAT BASIS, YOU KNOW, IT WAS WHERE
- 4 STAFF IS COMING FROM WITH THEIR RECOMMENDATION.
- 5 MEMBER RELIS: OKAY. THANK YOU, MR.
- 6 CHANDLER. WELL, WE'VE COME TO EXPECT IN SAN DIEGO
- 7 COUNTY AND CITY THINGS ARE ALWAYS DYNAMIC, AND THIS
- 8 JUST UNDERSCORES THAT. BUT HAVING SAID THAT, I
- 9 FEEL THAT THE QUESTIONS I ASKED ABOUT MOONLIGHTING,
- 10 ABOUT IS THERE COVERAGE, I THINK I FEEL SATISFIED
- 11 THAT IT'S BEEN ANSWERED.
- 12 STAFF HAVE REVIEWED AND RECOMMENDED
- 13 AN INTERIM ARRANGEMENT. I THINK THE CONDITIONS, AS
- MR. CHANDLER POINTED OUT, IF YOU WANTED TO DIAGRAM
- 15 THE REST OF THE STATE, YOU MIGHT FIND EQUALLY
- 16 CHALLENGING DIAGRAMS AND CONNECTIONS. AND UNLESS
- 17 WE'RE PREPARED TO DO THAT, I DON'T FIND THAT
- 18 THIS -- IS IT HAS ITS UNIQUE ASPECTS, BUT I DON'T
- 19 FIND IT FUNDAMENTALLY AT ODDS WITH WHAT WE DO
- ELSEWHERE.
- 21 PERSONNEL ARE QUALIFIED. THERE'S A
- 22 BACKSTOP ROLE WHICH WE'VE HEARD IF THE QUESTION IS
- 23 WHAT IF SOMEBODY ISN'T AVAILABLE, WHO'S GOING TO BE

- THERE. THIS IS, AFTER ALL, A TRANSITION, AS I
- 25 UNDERSTAND IT. AND THE FALLBACK IS TO YANK IT IF

- 1 THERE'S A BREAKDOWN. SO I'M PREPARED TO MOVE THE
- 2 STAFF RECOMMENDATION.
- 3 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: I'LL SECOND THAT. ANY
- 4 FURTHER DISCUSSION? WE HAVE A MOTION AND SECOND,
- 5 THEN, ON THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 97-508,
- 6 CONSIDERATION OF A TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION AND
- 7 DESIGNATION TO THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENTAL
- 8 SERVICES DEPARTMENT AS THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
- 9 FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. IF THE SECRETARY WILL
- 10 CALL THE ROLL ON THAT, PLEASE.
- 11 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
- 12 MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER JONES.
- MEMBER JONES: NO.
- THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN FRAZEE.
- 16 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AYE. MOTION IS CARRIED
- 17 AND WE'LL GO ON TO THE FULL BOARD.
- THE REPORTER: THE COURT REPORTER NEEDS A
- 19 SHORT BREAK.
- 20 (A BREAK WAS THEN TAKEN.)
- 21 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: MEETING WILL COME TO
- ORDER AGAIN, PLEASE. IT'S THE INTENTION OF THE
- 23 CHAIR TO TAKE UP ITEM 11 AT THIS TIME, AND THEN WE

- 24 WILL TAKE A LUNCH BREAK FOLLOWING THE PROCESSING OF
- THIS ITEM.

1

23

LEGAL AUTHORITY ISSUES AND STAFF OPTIONS RELATING 2 TO CONSTRUCTION, DEMOLITION, AND INERT TIER 3 REGULATIONS. STAFF REPORT. MR. BLOCK: MORNING, CHAIRMAN FRAZEE AND 5 COMMITTEE MEMBERS. I'M ELLIOT BLOCK FROM THE LEGAL 6 OFFICE PRESENTING THIS ITEM TO YOU. 7 8 THIS ITEM IS THE LATEST IN A LINE OF 9 A SERIES OF LEGAL AUTHORITY ITEMS THAT WE HAVE 10 BROUGHT FORWARD IN THE PAST REGARDING VARIOUS TIER 11 REGULATIONS PACKAGES THAT WE'VE BROUGHT FORWARD, AND THOSE ARE UP ON THE BOARD, PACKAGES WE'VE DONE 12 SO FAR. 13 14 AND WE HAVE ON THE CURRENT SCHEDULE FOUR MORE THAT WE ARE SCHEDULED TO DO OVER THE 15 COURSE OF THE NEXT YEAR OR SO. CONSTRUCTION 16 DEMOLITION DEBRIS AND INERTS BEING ONE OF THEM. 17 WHAT PLACES US IN THE ARENA OF 18 DEALING WITH THIS ISSUE IN THE FIRST PLACE IS 19 LANGUAGE IN DEFINITION OF SOLID WASTE IN PUBLIC 20 RESOURCES CODE WHICH LISTS AS ONE OF THE EXAMPLES 21 22 SOLID WASTE DEMOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION WASTE. FOR

THAT REASON, THIS WAS -- THAT -- AND THIS IS ONE OF

ITEM 11 IS THE CONSIDERATION OF THE

- 24 THE MATERIALS THAT WERE CONSIDERED NONTRADITIONAL
- AS WE MOVE FORWARD WITH THE TIER REQUIREMENTS AND

WHERE WE WERE LOOKING TO PROVIDE SOME CLARITY 1 2 AROUND THE STATE FOR HOW THESE MATERIALS WILL BE 3 HANDLED. WE HAVE A DEFINITION EXISTING IN OUR REGULATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION WASTES: 5 6 BUILDING MATERIALS, PACKAGING AND RUBBLE RESULTING FROM CONSTRUCTION, REMODELING, REPAIR, AND 7 DEMOLITION OPERATIONS ON PAVEMENTS, HOUSES, 8 9 COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS, AND OTHER STRUCTURES. LIKEWISE, WE NOW HAVE WITHIN TITLE 27 10 11 REGULATIONS, SINCE WE HAVE COMBINED THESE WITH THE WATER BOARD, A DEFINITION OF INERT WASTE. IT'S 12 PRIMARILY DERIVED FROM THE WATER BOARD'S 13 14 REGULATIONS UNDER FORMER TITLE 23. INERT WASTE BEING THAT SUBSET OF SOLID WASTE THAT DOES NOT 15 CONTAIN HAZARDOUS WASTE OR SOLUBLE POLLUTANTS IN 16 CONCENTRATIONS IN EXCESS OF APPLICABLE WATER 17 QUALITY OBJECTIVES AND DOES NOT CONTAIN SIGNIFICANT 18 QUANTITIES OF DECOMPOSABLE WASTE. 19 THOSE LATTER TWO DEFINITIONS, AS I 20 MENTIONED, ARE IN REGULATION. ONE OF THE THINGS 21 WE'LL PROBABLY BE DOING AS WE BRING THIS PACKAGE 22

FORWARD IS LOOKING AS TO WHETHER WE NEED TO MODIFY

23

- 24 THOSE DEFINITIONS OR NOT. I'VE SHOWED THEM
- 25 PRIMARILY FOR THE PURPOSE OF GIVING A GENERAL IDEA

OF THE SCOPE OF THE MATERIALS WE'RE TALKING ABOUT IN THIS REGULATION PACKAGE. IN ADDITION, LET ME JUST GO AHEAD AND 3 JUST GIVE A QUICK MENTION TO ANOTHER ASPECT OF THIS RULEMAKING PACKAGE THAT HAS COME UP IN THE LAST FEW 5 6 MONTHS. IN ADDITION TO ALREADY BEING ON OUR SCHEDULE FOR REVIEWING THESE UNDER THE TIER 7 PACKAGE, SOME LANGUAGE WAS ADDED INTO THE BUDGET 8 9 BILL REGARDING THE BOARD DRAFTING REGULATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION DEBRIS AND PROVIDING A 10 REPORT, STATUS REPORT, TO THE LEGISLATURE BY APRIL 11 1ST, 1998. AND SO WE WILL ALSO BE ACCOMPLISHING 12 THAT AS PART OF THIS RULEMAKING PACKAGE. 13 14 IN GENERAL, WHAT I PROBABLY WANT TO DO, SINCE WE'RE CLOSE TO LUNCH HOUR AND YOU'VE HAD 15 QUITE A BIT OF DISCUSSION ALREADY TODAY, JUST VERY 16 BRIEFLY MENTION THE LEGAL ANALYSIS AND THEN PERHAPS 17 SEE IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING THAT. BUT 18 BASICALLY WHAT WE'VE DONE IN THIS LEGAL AUTHORITY 19 ITEM IS THE SAME THING THAT WE'VE DONE WITH 20 PREVIOUS LEGAL AUTHORITY ITEMS. IT TRACKS VERY 21

CLOSELY WITH THE ASH LEGAL AUTHORITY ITEM AND THE

CONTAMINATED SOIL LEGAL AUTHORITY ITEM.

22

23

24			BASICALLY	WHAT	WE'RE	ASF	KING THE	
25	COMMITTEE	AND	ULTIMATELY	THE	BOARD	то	CONFIRM	IS
			103					

- 1 THAT THE BOARD HAS JURISDICTION OVER THE DISPOSAL,
- 2 TRANSFER PROCESSING, OR STORAGE OF CONSTRUCTION AND
- 3 DEMOLITION DEBRIS. AND THAT THE BOARD DOES NOT
- 4 HAVE JURISDICTION OVER MANUFACTURING, RECYCLING,
- 5 OTHER PRODUCTIVE USES, SUCH AS ROAD BASE OR
- 6 SUB-BASE, AND MINE RECLAMATION. THIS IS CONSISTENT
- 7 WITH THE LEGAL AUTHORITY ANALYSIS THAT WE'VE DONE
- 8 IN THE PAST.
- 9 IF THERE ARE SOME QUESTIONS, I CAN
- 10 CERTAINLY DISCUSS THE PARTICULAR STATUTES THAT
- 11 THOSE ARE BASED ON. BUT THAT IS BASICALLY THE
- 12 ANALYSIS, AND THAT'S THE RECOMMENDATION THAT WE'RE
- 13 MAKING TO THE COMMITTEE.
- 14 HAVING SAID THAT, OF COURSE, ONE OF
- 15 THE INTERESTING THINGS AND WHAT THESE LEGAL
- 16 AUTHORITIES ALWAYS TEND TO DO IS REALLY SERVE AS
- SORT OF THE FIRST ITEM IN A SERIES OF ITEMS AS WE
- 18 START DOING THESE PACKAGES AND IN A SENSE SORT OF
- 19 SCOPE OUT THE FRAMEWORK OF WHAT THE PACKAGE WILL BE
- 20 DOING.
- 21 IT'S EASY TO SAY THE BOARD DOESN'T
- 22 REGULATE RECYCLING, BUT HOW YOU DEFINE THAT IN ANY
- 23 PARTICULAR PACKAGE, OF COURSE, IS REALLY WHERE THE

- 24 REAL WORK OF THE PACKAGE WILL BE. SO IN ADDITION
- TO THAT, I HAVE INCLUDED IN THE AGENDA ITEM A LIST

1

1	AND SOME MINIMAL DISCUSSION OF SOME ISSUES THAT
2	HAVE COME UP AND THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO
3	ADDRESS AS THIS RULEMAKING PACKAGE GOES FORWARD.
4	PRIOR TO WELL, DURING AUGUST AND
5	SEPTEMBER, THE PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE
6	DID ARRANGE FOR AND HOLD THREE WORKSHOPS AROUND THE
7	STATE WITH INTERESTED PARTIES IN THIS AREA AND
8	PEOPLE THAT DEAL WITH CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION
9	DEBRIS IN REDDING, DIAMOND BAR, AND SACRAMENTO.
10	AND MARCIA KIESSE IS THE STAFF PERSON WHO'S THE
11	PRIMARY LEAD ON THIS RULEMAKING PACKAGE. OF
12	COURSE, BOB HOLMES IS ALSO THE COORDINATOR FOR THE
13	TIER REGS, SET THOSE UP AND HELPED THOSE GO.
14	A LOT OF ISSUES CAME UP AT THOSE
15	WORKSHOPS. I HAVE IDENTIFIED IN THE AGENDA ITEM
16	AND THEY'RE LISTED HERE ON THE OVERHEAD SOME OF THE
17	MAJOR CATEGORIES OF ISSUES THAT ARE THERE. THESE
18	ARE NOT ISSUES WE'RE ASKING FOR THE BOARD THE
19	COMMITTEE OR THE BOARD TO MAKE DECISIONS FOR US
20	TODAY. OF COURSE, IF THE COMMITTEE OR THE BOARD
21	DID HAVE SOME DIRECTION THAT THEY WANTED TO GIVE
22	US, WE WOULD TAKE THAT AND GO WITH THAT. OF
23	COURSE, ALSO, THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR ANY

AND SOME MINIMAL DISCUSSION OF SOME ISSUES THAT

- 24 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC IF THEY WANTED TO PROVIDE
- 25 SOME INPUT IF THEY HAD PARTICULAR IDEAS ABOUT SOME

OF THESE ISSUES TO PROVIDE THAT INPUT. VERY QUICKLY THOUGH, THOSE ISSUES ARE 2 LEVEL OF APPROPRIATE REGULATION, AS WE'VE DONE IN 3 THE PAST LEGAL AUTHORITY ITEMS. ONE OF THE THINGS WE ALWAYS TRY TO UNDERSCORE IS THE FACT THAT WHILE 5 6 ANY PARTICULAR OPERATION MAY BE WITHIN THE BOARD'S GENERAL JURISDICTION, AND I USE THAT TERM 7 SPECIFICALLY FOR SPECIFIC REASON, THE BOARD STILL 8 9 THEN HAS ANOTHER STEP TO UNDERGO, WHICH IS DECIDE, ONCE WE'VE DECIDED IT'S WITHIN OUR GENERAL 10 11 JURISDICTION, WHAT'S THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF REGULATION. AND THAT'S, FOR INSTANCE, WHERE WE'VE 12 USED THE EXCLUDED TIER IN THE PAST WHERE WE 13 14 DETERMINED THAT WHILE WE HAVE JURISDICTION OVER X ACTIVITY, FOR INSTANCE BACKYARD COMPOSTING, THAT IF 15 THE BOARD DIDN'T FEEL IT WAS APPROPRIATE TO 16 REGULATE THAT ACTIVITY. 17 WE ALSO HAVE AN EXISTING PERMIT 18 EXEMPTION IN OUR REGULATIONS THAT'S BEEN ON THE 19 BOOKS FOR 20, 25 YEARS NOW PROBABLY, WHICH 20 ESTABLISHES A PROCEDURE FOR AND CERTAIN REQUIRED 21 FINDINGS FOR OBTAINING AN EXEMPTION FROM SOLID 22

WASTE FACILITY PERMIT REQUIREMENT. AND ONE OF THE

23

- 24 TYPES OF FACILITIES THAT IS ELIGIBLE FOR THAT
- 25 EXEMPTION IS AN UNCLASSIFIED WASTE SITE. AND

GENERALLY THAT WOULD INCLUDE INERT DISPOSAL 1 FACILITIES, AND THERE ARE SOMEWHERE BETWEEN HALF A 2 DOZEN AND A DOZEN INERT SITES AROUND THE STATE THAT 3 HAVE RECEIVED THIS EXEMPTION. IN ADDITION, SOME ISSUES CAME UP 5 6 REGARDING -- I'VE LISTED IT AS DEFINING SEPARATED FOR REUSE BASICALLY, DEFINING RECYCLING WITHIN THE 7 8 CONTEXT OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION DEBRIS. AS 9 THE COMMITTEE IS GOING TO BE HEARING THIS AFTERNOON, THERE HAS BEEN A LOT OF DISCUSSION 10 AROUND DEFINING RECYCLING FOR WHAT, FOR LACK OF A 11 BETTER TERM, I BELIEVE ARE MORE TRADITIONAL TYPES 12 OF RECYCLING. AND THERE ARE SOME ISSUES THAT HAVE 13 14 BEEN RAISED ABOUT WHETHER THAT DEFINITION WORKS OR NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION DEBRIS GIVEN 15 16 THE RELATIVE WEIGHT OF THE MATERIAL WE'RE DEALING WITH AND THE DIFFERENT MANNER IN WHICH IT IS 17 18 HANDLED. LIKEWISE, LENGTH OF STORAGE TIME, IN 19 PAST REGULATIONS PACKAGES, WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO 20 IDENTIFY A LIMIT ON STORAGE TIME OF MATERIAL, WHICH 21 THEN GIVES RISE TO A PRESUMPTION THAT A STORAGE 22

OPERATION IS, IN FACT, A DISPOSAL SITE WITH -- I'M

23

- GOING TO FORGET -- I ALWAYS FORGET WHICH ONE -- I
- 25 BELIEVE WITH ASH, IT WAS SIX MONTHS AND WITH

- 1 CONTAMINATED SOIL, IT WAS ONE YEAR.
- 2 WHAT WE FOUND, WE HAD A LOT OF
- 3 COMMENTS AT THE WORKSHOPS THAT, IN FACT, THAT TIME
- 4 FRAME DOESN'T REALLY WORK FOR CONSTRUCTION AND
- 5 DEMOLITION DEBRIS BECAUSE THIS MATERIAL MAY STAY ON
- 6 SITE FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS BEFORE IT'S ACTUALLY
- 7 PROCESSED. SO THAT'S ANOTHER ISSUE WE'RE GOING TO
- 8 BE GRAPPLING WITH.
- 9 AND THEN FINALLY ON THE LIST, JUST
- 10 LOOKING AT THE ISSUE OF THE DEFINITION OF INERT,
- 11 AS I MENTIONED, THE DEFINITION IN TITLE 27 NOW
- 12 COMES FROM FORMER TITLE 23 DEFINITIONS FROM THE
- 13 WATER BOARD, AND IT'S PHRASED PRIMARILY IN TERMS OF
- 14 WATER QUALITY. AND SO WE HAD SOME DISCUSSION AT
- THE WORKSHOPS AS TO WHETHER THAT WAS SUFFICIENT OR
- 16 WHETHER WE NEEDED TO FURTHER DEFINE THAT AND/OR
- 17 PERHAPS EVEN PROVIDE EXAMPLES.
- 18 ONE OF THE WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS, FOR
- 19 INSTANCE, HANDED US A COPY OF HIS WDR'S. AND IF
- YOU LOOK AT THE WDR'S FOR HIS FACILITY, IT ACTUALLY
- 21 LISTS TEN MATERIAL TYPES THAT ARE ALLOWABLE INERT
- 22 TYPES.
- 23 AND WITH THAT, I THINK I'LL PROBABLY

- 24 STOP THERE. I PROBABLY WENT LONGER THAN I MEANT TO
- DO. AND JUST IN CLOSING, STATE THAT WHAT WE'D LIKE

- 1 THE COMMITTEE TO DO IS CONFIRM THAT WE DO HAVE
- 2 AUTHORITY OVER DISPOSAL, TRANSFER PROCESSING, AND
- 3 STORAGE OF CONSTRUCTION-DEMOLITION DEBRIS AND
- 4 INERTS. AND THAT WE DO NOT HAVE JURISDICTION OVER
- 5 MANUFACTURING, RECYCLING, OTHER PRODUCTIVE USES,
- 6 AND MINE RECLAMATION, AND FORWARD THIS TO THE
- 7 BOARD. HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?
- 8 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: THAT LIST OF WHAT IS
- 9 INCLUDED AND WHAT IS NOT INCLUDED HAS THE ABILITY
- 10 TO FLOW AS THESE REGULATIONS ARE DEVELOPED, I WOULD
- 11 ASSUME, TO BE FURTHER DEFINED.
- MR. BLOCK: RIGHT.
- 13 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: FOR EXAMPLE, WHERE DOES
- 14 MANUFACTURING BEGIN? THE ITEM 3, THE BOARD HAS THE
- 15 AUTHORITY TO REGULATE THE STORAGE OF CONSTRUCTION
- AND DEMOLITION AND INERT DEBRIS. WHERE DOES --
- WHERE DOES STORAGE BEGIN?
- AND TO TRY TO PUT THIS IN CONTEXT OF
- 19 SOME REAL LIVE EXAMPLES, AND I KEEP GOING BACK TO
- THIS ONE, BUT A MAJOR PROJECT THAT I'VE BEEN
- 21 WATCHING AT THE SAN DIEGO AIRPORT INVOLVES TEARING
- UP A LOT OF CONCRETE AND REPROCESSING IT ON SITE,
- 23 CONVERTING IT INTO A MATERIAL THAT THEN IS LAID

- DOWN FOR ROAD BASE. YOU KNOW, DOES ANY PART OF
- THAT OPERATION FALL UNDER REGULATIONS?

1	MR. BLOCK: AND THAT IS AN ISSUE THOSE
2	ARE THE ISSUES THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE GRAPPLING
3	WITH AS WE TRY TO DRAFT SOME REGULATIONS ON THESE.
4	OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD, THAT WOULD PROBABLY FALL
5	INTO THE AREA WHERE WE WOULD HAVE TO DEFINE WHETHER
6	THAT'S CONSIDERED A PRODUCTIVE USE OR NOT AND
7	WHETHER OR NOT THERE NEEDS TO BE ANY LIMITS ON
8	YOU KNOW, CAN THAT MATERIAL STAY THERE FOR THREE
9	YEARS BEFORE IT'S ACTUALLY USED AS ROAD BASE? OR
10	DOES THERE NEED TO BE AN ONGOING OPERATION?
11	THOSE ARE CLEARLY GOING TO BE ISSUES
12	THAT TAKE SOME WORK. LEGAL AUTHORITY ITEM ITSELF
13	IS REALLY JUST SORT OF THE BROAD OVERALL ISSUES OF
14	WHAT'S IN AND WITHIN THE BOARD'S JURISDICTION TO
15	REGULATE AND WHAT'S NOT. AND THERE IS CLEARLY ROOM
16	FOR US. WE'VE HAD ANOTHER REGULATIONS PACKAGE.
17	THERE'S ROOM AROUND THE EDGES FOR HOW THAT'S
18	DEFINED, AND IT DOES CHANGE FROM MATERIAL TYPE TO
19	MATERIAL TYPE.
20	THERE ARE THINGS, ISSUES REGARDING
21	CONSTRUCTION-DEMOLITION DEBRIS THAT ARE DIFFERENT
22	FROM SOME OF THE OTHER ONES THAT WE'VE DEALT WITH.

THE STORAGE TIME BEING ONE OF THOSE. WHAT WORKED

- FOR CONTAMINATED SOIL, ONE YEAR, APPARENTLY WHAT
- WE'RE HEARING FROM AROUND THE STATE, DOESN'T WORK.

```
CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AND THEN THE DEFINITION
 1
      OF CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION, IT CAN BE ALL WOOD
 2
      OR IT CAN BE ALL CONCRETE, AND THE STORAGE TIME MAY
 3
      VARY --
              MR. BLOCK: RIGHT.
 5
 6
               CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: -- BETWEEN TYPES.
               MR. BLOCK: EXACTLY. THAT'S ANOTHER ISSUE
 7
       THAT CAME UP AS WELL. WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT
 8
 9
       THIS RULEMAKING AS CONSTRUCTION, DEMOLITION, AND
       INERT DEBRIS. WE DID GET A LOT OF INPUT AT THE
10
11
       WORKSHOPS THAT, IN A SENSE, WE PROBABLY HAVE TO
       DEAL WITH THOSE THREE THINGS IN AT LEAST TWO
12
       SEPARATE CATEGORIES. INERT BEING PERHAPS A SUBSET
13
14
       OF, BUT SOMETHING DIFFERENT THAN CONSTRUCTION AND
      DEMOLITION DEBRIS.
15
                     CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION DEBRIS
16
       CAN INCLUDE, THEORETICALLY, THE WAY SOME PEOPLE USE
17
       THAT TERM, THINGS THAT ARE NOT INERT. AND THAT
18
       WOULD THEN YIELD SOME DIFFERENT STANDARDS THAT WE
19
      MIGHT OR DIFFERENT LEVELS OF REGULATION THAT WE
20
      MIGHT OR MIGHT NOT WANT TO APPLY TO THOSE.
21
22
                    WE ARE -- I'LL JUST REPEAT IT AGAIN.
```

WE'RE NOT ASKING FOR DECISIONS ON THOSE TODAY, BUT

- 24 THOSE ARE DEFINITELY ISSUES WE'RE GOING TO BE
- 25 GRAPPLING WITH. WE ARE GOING TO BE PUTTING

- 1 TOGETHER, AFTER THE COMMITTEE AND THEN THE BOARD
- 2 HEARS THIS ITEM, A WORKING GROUP TO SIT DOWN AND
- 3 START DRAFTING REGULATIONS AND DEALING WITH THOSE
- 4 ISSUES.
- 5 MEMBER JONES: YOU HAD SAID, ELLIOT, THAT
- 6 THERE WERE SOME INERT MATERIALS THAT COULD FALL
- 7 UNDER AN EXEMPTION. I MEAN WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT
- 8 BLANKET EXEMPTIONS FOR INERT MATERIALS, ARE WE?
- 9 BECAUSE TIRES FALL INTO THE DEFINITION OF INERT AS
- 10 EVERY ONE I'VE EVER SEEN.
- MR. BLOCK: WELL, I'M CERTAINLY NOT
- 12 TALKING ABOUT ANYTHING ONE WAY OR THE OTHER IN THAT
- 13 REGARD. WHAT I WAS TRYING TO GET AT AND MAKE SURE
- JUST GOT INTO THE -- EVERYBODY'S THOUGHTS IN TERMS
- OF DISCUSSION IS THAT WE DO HAVE THIS EXISTING
- 16 EXEMPTION PROCESS. THERE'S A PROCESS THAT THE LEA
- 17 HAS TO GO THROUGH AND HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING AND
- 18 MAKE VARIOUS FINDINGS. AND WE HAVE IN THE PAST NOT
- 19 HAD TO DIRECTLY DEAL WITH THIS EXISTING REGULATION
- 20 IN SOME OF THE EARLIER TIER PACKAGES, BUT WE
- 21 CERTAINLY DO IN THIS PACKAGE BECAUSE WE DO HAVE, AS
- 22 I SAID, I DON'T KNOW THE EXACT NUMBER, BETWEEN HALF
- 23 A DOZEN AND DOZEN EXEMPT INERT DISPOSAL SITES IN

- THE STATE RIGHT NOW. AND SO WE ARE GOING TO HAVE
- TO DETERMINE HOW WE DO OR DON'T TREAT THOSE

```
EXISTING SITES AND/OR FUTURE ONES.
 1
                     THAT ALSO LEADS INTO THE ISSUE OF
 2
       WHETHER OR NOT WE NEED TO LOOK AT MORE SPECIFICALLY
 3
       DEFINING INERT. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, THE
       DEFINITION IS FAIRLY GENERAL IN THE REGULATIONS,
 5
 6
       AND THAT'S PRIMARILY BECAUSE IT DOES COME OUT OF
       THE WATER BOARD'S REGULATIONS, AND THEY'VE USED
 7
       WDR'S TO FURTHER DEFINE THOSE. AND THAT'S WHERE
 8
 9
       THOSE ISSUES WILL COME OUT.
                    HAVING SAID THAT, I DO NEED TO LET
10
11
       YOU KNOW THAT WE DID HAVE SOME WORKSHOP PARTICI-
      PANTS THAT WOULD ASK THE BOARD TO DO EXACTLY THAT,
12
      TO GIVE A BLANKET EXEMPTION TO ALL INERT MATERIALS
13
14
      FACILITIES THAT ARE OPERATIONS THAT HANDLE INERT
      MATERIALS. AND THAT'S ONE OF THE -- THAT'S SOME OF
15
       THE VIEWS YOU ARE GOING TO BE HEARING AS WE MOVE
16
       THIS PACKAGE THROUGH.
17
               MEMBER RELIS: I KNOW THERE'S SPEAKERS, I
18
       GUESS, BUT MY ONLY THOUGHT WAS, ASSUMING WE GET
19
       THROUGH THE LEGAL DECISION TODAY, THAT THIS IS AN
20
      AREA I KNOW WHERE I NEED MUCH MORE EDUCATION TO
21
      UNDERSTAND THE NUANCES BETWEEN, YOU KNOW, INERTS
22
```

AND STORAGE. AND I DON'T REALLY UNDERSTAND THIS

- AREA AS WELL AS OTHER AREAS, AND I HOPE WE COULD
- 25 DEVELOP SOME SORT OF EDUCATION PROGRAM, IF THE

- 1 OTHER MEMBERS FEEL THAT WAY, THAT ARE LIKE WHAT WE
- 2 DID WITH THE ASH, OR WE HAD SOME PRESENTATION IN A
- 3 WORKSHOP-TYPE SETTING WHERE WE COULD INFORMALLY
- 4 INTERACT AROUND A BODY OF INFORMATION SO THAT WHEN
- 5 THE TOUGH WORK REALLY BEGINS AFTER WE MAKE THE
- 6 DECISION ON THIS.
- 7 MS. RICE: WE CAN CERTAINLY DO THAT, MR.
- 8 RELIS.
- 9 MR. BLOCK: I DO NEED TO SAY ONE
- 10 ADDITIONAL THING. BECAUSE OF SOME KINKS IN MY
- 11 SCHEDULE, THE ACTUAL -- THIS AGENDA ITEM DID NOT
- 12 MAKE IT INTO THE AGENDA PACKET. WE DID FAX COPIES
- OUT ON FRIDAY TO AS MANY PEOPLE AS WE COULD, BUT
- 14 WE, I'M SURE, MISSED SOME FOLKS. AND SO IF THERE'S
- ANYBODY IN THE AUDIENCE THAT DIDN'T GET THIS AND
- 16 WOULD LIKE A COPY, YOU CAN CONTACT EITHER MYSELF,
- 17 MARCIA, OR BOB HOLMES. AND ALSO, THIS ITEM
- 18 ESSENTIALLY IN THE SAME FORM WILL BE IN THE BOARD
- 19 PACKET AS IT MOVES FORWARD. I WANTED TO MENTION
- THAT.
- 21 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: LET'S HEAR FROM CHUCK
- 22 WHITE REPRESENTING WASTE MANAGEMENT.
- MR. WHITE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN,

- 24 MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. CHUCK WHITE WITH WASTE
- 25 MANAGEMENT. I WON'T TAKE MUCH OF YOUR TIME, BUT

YOUR DISCUSSION SO FAR HAS REALLY HIGHLIGHTED THE 1 ISSUE IS THAT THE ISSUES LAID OUT HERE ARE NEAT AND 2 COMPARTMENTALIZED, BUT IN REALITY WHEN YOU GET INTO 3 THE THING, THEY'RE NOT GOING TO BE SO NEAT AND COMPARTMENTALIZED. AND THEY IN MANY CASES WILL BE 5 6 AT CROSS PURPOSES. I JUST POINT OUT AS AN EXAMPLE THAT 7 THE ISSUE OF MINE RECLAMATION. AND WE CERTAINLY 8 9 DON'T WANT TO GET INTO ARGUMENTS WITH OUR FRIENDS IN THE MINING INDUSTRY, BUT CLEARLY THERE ARE 10 11 SITUATIONS WHERE YOU HAVE LANDFILLS THAT ARE ALSO MINE RECLAMATION PROJECTS. AND THE QUESTION, IS IT 12 SOLELY A MINE RECLAMATION PROJECT OR IS IT ALSO A 13 14 LANDFILL, OR DOES IT HAVE ATTRIBUTES OF BOTH? IF SO, HOW DOES THE BOARD GET IN AND REGULATE THOSE 15 KIND OF ACTIVITIES, PARTICULARLY WITH CONSTRUCTION 16 AND DEMOLITION DEBRIS? 17 AS YOU POINTED OUT, THERE ARE A WIDE 18 VARIETY OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF CONSTRUCTION-19 DEMOLITION DEBRIS. OUR COMPANY AND OTHERS DID A 20 STUDY BACK IN OHIO TO SHOW THAT YOU CAN HAVE 21 CONSTRUCTION, C&D WASTE THAT LEACHATE FROM, 22 ALTHOUGH I KNOW THAT LEACHATE IS NOT YOUR PRIMARY 23

- 24 CONCERN, LEACHATE DOES LOOK LIKE MUNICIPAL SOLID
- WASTE LANDFILL LEACHATE COMING FROM C&D WASTE.

ON THE OTHER HAND, YOU CAN HAVE 1 TOTALLY INERT WASTES THAT BASICALLY ARE FAR LESS OF 2 A CONCERN BOTH FROM A LEACHATE GENERATION 3 STANDPOINT OR DUST GENERATION STANDPOINT. AND SO HOW DO YOU GET IN AND MAKE SURE THAT THERE ARE 5 6 THOSE SITUATIONS? AND THE LANGUAGE YOU HAVE HERE IN THIS AGENDA ITEM TALKS ABOUT C&D AND INERT 7 DEBRIS WOULD NOT BE WITHIN THE WASTE BOARD'S 8 9 JURISDICTION IF THEY CONSTITUTE PRODUCTIVE USES AND 10 DO NOT FIT WITHIN THE DEFINITION OF SOLID WASTE 11 DISPOSAL. I DON'T THINK I TAKE ARGUMENT WITH 12 THOSE, BUT THE QUESTION IS WHAT DISPOSAL VERSUS 13 14 WHAT IS PRODUCTIVE USE OF MATERIAL? YOU MIGHT HAVE ONE STANDARD FOR TRULY INERT WASTE, BUT IT MAY BE A 15 DIFFERENT STANDARD FOR MATERIAL THAT HAS A HIGHER 16 DEGREE OF CONTAMINATION IN IT. AND THESE ARE 17 REALLY -- THE DEVIL IS GOING TO BE IN THE DETAILS 18 WITH RESPECT TO THIS PARTICULAR REGULATION PACKAGE 19 AND OTHERS AS YOU MOVE FORWARD INTO THESE 20 NONTRADITIONAL WASTE HANDLING TYPES. 21 22 I THINK THERE ARE PROBABLY WAYS WE CAN WORK IT OUT. I THINK GENERALLY THE, IF NOT, 23

- 24 CONSENSUS, THE CONSENT OF THE WORK GROUP SO FAR IS
- THAT THEY DO RECOGNIZE THAT THERE IS SOMETHING

- 1 CALLED INERT. THE QUESTION IS CAN YOU GUARANTEE
- 2 THAT IT'S INERT? WHAT KIND OF PROCESSES AND
- 3 PROCEDURES ARE OPERATORS USING TO ENSURE THAT IT'S
- 4 INERT? AND IF IT IS TRULY INERT, THEN IT CAN BE
- 5 SUBJECT TO ONE DIFFERENT STANDARD VERSUS MATERIAL
- 6 THAT IS MORE COMMINGLED C&D WASTE AND MAYBE SHOULD
- 7 BE SUBJECT TO DIFFERENT TYPE OF STANDARD FOR
- 8 PARTICULARLY PLACEMENT ON THE GROUND AND IN THE
- 9 LAND.
- 10 THAT'S MY ONLY POINT RIGHT NOW. I
- 11 LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH THE GROUP AS IT MOVES
- 12 FORWARD. THANK YOU.
- 13 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: EVAN EDGAR REPRESENTING
- 14 CRRC.
- MR. EDGAR: GOOD AFTERNOON, CHAIRMAN AND
- 16 BOARD MEMBERS. MY NAME IS EVAN EDGAR REPRESENTING
- 17 THE CALIFORNIA REFUSE REMOVAL COUNCIL. I SUPPORT
- 18 OPTION NO. 2 TODAY FOR THE WASTE BOARD TO CONFIRM
- 19 THE ANALYSIS AND WOULD HAVE LEGAL AUTHORITY TO
- 20 REGULATE C&D AND INERT DEBRIS AND DIRECT STAFF TO
- 21 SEEK ADDITIONAL INPUT. THIS IS KICK-OFF TO THE C&D
- 22 TIERS.
- 23 IT'S GOING TO BE ABOUT A YEAR-LONG

- 24 PROCESS. I LOOK FORWARD TO BEING ON THE WORKING
- 25 GROUP.

```
WITH RESPECT TO STAFF RECOMMENDATION,
 1
       WE SUPPORT ITEMS 1, 2, AND 3 WHERE YOU STATE YOU
 2
      HAVE A LEGAL AUTHORITY FOR C&D OPERATIONS. BUT
 3
      ALWAYS COMES DOWN TO DEFINITIONS ABOUT 4, 5, 6, AND
       7 BECAUSE I BELIEVE THAT THE DEFINITION FOR C&D IS
 5
      VERY GLOBAL. THERE'S A LOT THERE. IF YOU SEE THAT
 6
       STUFF, THERE'S A LOT OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF
 7
       MATERIALS; WHEREAS, INERT IS RATHER DEFINED.
 8
 9
                    IN FRONT OF US TODAY WAS A PERMIT FOR
       ZANKER ROAD LANDFILL WHICH I REPRESENT. AND THAT
10
11
      LANDFILL TAKES C&D MATERIALS. THEY'RE ABLE TO
      DIVERT 97 PERCENT. THEY ONLY DISPOSE OF 3 PERCENT
12
      ON SITE. THAT WAS A SIX-YEAR PERMITTING PROCESS
13
      WHERE YOU GOT A FULL PERMIT. BUT IN THAT CASE IT
14
      WAS AT AN OLDER LANDFILL, BUT THERE ARE LOT OF
15
      ISSUES THAT THE WASTE BOARD HAS IN REGULATING AT
16
      C&D FACILITIES WHEN SITED AT A LANDFILL.
17
                    SO WHAT I'M UP HERE ON THE TRAIL OF
18
       TIERS OVER THE LAST THREE, FOUR YEARS IS REGULATORY
19
      EQUITY. AS REGULATORY EQUITY, SOMETHING THAT NEEDS
20
      TO APPLY TO THE MINE RECLAMATION PROJECTS AS WELL
21
      BECAUSE THEY'RE DOING THE SAME THING WE'RE DOING.
22
```

WE GET THE FULL PERMIT AND THEY WANT AN EXCLUSION.

24 UNDER THE WATER BOARD, I GUESS,
25 DEFAULT POLICY IS THAT THEY LOOK AT A 10-PERCENT
118

- 1 RESIDUAL, I GUESS, IN ORDER TO BE INERT MATERIALS.
- 2 THAT DEFINITION IS ON PAGE 11-9 DEFINING INERT,
- 3 SECOND PARAGRAPH. TALKS ABOUT, IN ADDITION, THE
- 4 REGIONAL BOARD IS ALSO TO ALLOW A 10-PERCENT
- 5 NONINERT TO BE INCLUDED WITHIN THE MATERIALS
- 6 HANDLED. AND THAT'S A BIG NUMBER AS WE'RE FINDING
- 7 OUT IN OTHER CASES. BUT THAT IS THE DEFINITION
- 8 WE'RE USING. SO THERE'S A LOT OF DEFINITION THAT
- 9 WE HAVE TO TALK ABOUT OVER THE NEXT YEAR.
- 10 I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH THE
- 11 WORKING GROUP. THANK YOU.
- 12 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: I'M CONFUSED BY YOUR
- 13 STATEMENT NEXT YEAR. I THOUGHT WE WERE GOING TO
- 14 HAVE THIS DONE BY APRIL.
- MR. BLOCK: THE REQUIREMENT BY APRIL IS
- 16 THAT WE HAVE SOME DRAFT REGULATIONS --
- 17 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: DRAFT REGULATIONS.
- 18 OKAY.
- 19 MR. BLOCK: -- IN OUR REPORT, NOT THAT
- 20 REGULATIONS BE FINISHED.
- 21 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY.
- 22 I DIDN'T -- LARRY SWEETSER FROM
- NORCAL WASTE SYSTEMS.

MR. SWEETSER: LARRY SWEETSER, NORCAL

WASTE SYSTEMS, AND I'LL BE BRIEF ON IT ALSO. AS

- 1 FAR AS THE AUTHORITY ISSUE, I THINK IT IS TIME TO
- 2 GO AHEAD. I THINK I AGREE WITH THE STAFF, THAT
- 3 THERE IS AUTHORITY FOR THAT. AND I HOPE WE'RE NOT
- 4 GOING TO BE AT THIS POINT JUST ANSWERING THE
- 5 AUTHORITY QUESTION TODAY AND GET INTO SOME OF THE
- 6 DEFINITIONAL ISSUES PER SE THAT WE'LL BE TALKING
- 7 ABOUT LATER TODAY.
- 8 BUT AS FAR AS AUTHORITY, THERE IS,
- 9 YES. I THINK YOU DO NEED TO FOCUS IT. THERE IS A
- 10 BIG DISTINCTION -- AND I DID ATTEND THE WORKSHOPS
- 11 AND TALK TO OTHER PEOPLE BETWEEN -- THERE'S A
- 12 DISTINCTION BETWEEN C&D AND BETWEEN INERT. INERT
- 13 IS A LOT EASIER TO DEFINE AND DEAL WITH EXCEPT FOR
- 14 THE TIRE ISSUE OR ASBESTOS. WE CAN DEAL WITH THAT,
- 15 AND IT'S A LOT SIMPLER TO DEAL WITH.
- 16 WHEN YOU START DEALING WITH THE C&D
- 17 ISSUE, YOU COME INTO NO DEFINITIONS, AND YOU WILL
- 18 BE SEEING THIS LITTLE GRAPHIC AGAIN LATER, PROBABLY
- 19 SEEING MANY A PICTURE OF THIS SITE. IT'S ONE OF
- 20 YOUR 2136 NOMINEES. AND THAT IS DESCRIBED AS A C&D
- 21 OPERATION.
- 22 AND SO YOU NEED TO BE CAREFUL WHEN
- 23 CONSIDERING THAT, JUST LIKE WE'LL BE TALKING ABOUT

- 24 LATER TODAY, THAT THERE ARE THESE FACILITIES IN
- 25 BETWEEN, THOSE OF US THAT ARE PERMITTED AND THOSE

- OF US THAT ARE OUTSIDE YOUR AUTHORITY. AND I'VE
- 2 TALKED WITH A LOT OF THE INERT PEOPLE, AND I THINK
- 3 A LOT OF IT COMES DOWN TO THE DEFINITIONAL ISSUES,
- 4 THE INERT VERSUS C&D, AND ALSO THE STORAGE TIME
- 5 ISSUE.
- 6 I DIDN'T SEE IT DISCUSSED IN THE
- 7 STAFF REPORT, BUT ONE OF THE ITEMS WE WERE TRYING
- 8 TO RAISE WAS THAT THERE'S A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
- 9 STORAGE TIME OF INCOMING PILES AND A DIFFERENCE
- 10 BETWEEN STORAGE TIME OF OUTGOING PILES. IF YOU
- 11 HAVE MATERIALS THAT HAVE BEEN PROCESSED, AWAITING A
- MARKET OUT THERE, THERE'S LESS OF AN ISSUE BECAUSE,
- 13 ESPECIALLY IN AN INERT CASE, IT'S INERT, IT'S NOT
- 14 AN ISSUE. BUT IF YOU HAVE A PILE SITTING THERE
- 15 THAT HAS NOT BEEN SORTED AND YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT IS
- 16 IN THERE, THAT NEEDS LIMITATIONS, THAT NEEDS
- 17 CONTROLS. SO WE'RE LESS CONCERNED ON AFTER IT'S
- 18 BEEN PROCESSED, BUT BEFORE IT'S BEEN PROCESSED IS
- 19 WHEN WE HAVE A PROBLEM SUCH AS THIS ONE HERE. I'LL
- 20 LEAVE IT AT THAT FOR THE MOMENT, AND HOPE YOU GO
- 21 AHEAD WITH THE PACKAGE.
- 22 CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY. THANK YOU. THE
- 23 ITEM IS BEFORE US. THAT'S ALL THE SPEAKERS.

- 24 MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I WOULD MOVE THE
- 25 STAFF OPTION -- MAKE SURE I GET THE RIGHT ONE HERE.

```
WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE FUNDAMENTALLY BETWEEN 1 AND
 2
      2?
              MR. BLOCK: THE ONLY REAL DIFFERENCE
 3
      BETWEEN 1 AND 2 IS THAT, ONE, WE WANTED TO ALLOW
      SOME ABILITY OF THE COMMITTEE, IF WE HAD SOME
 5
 6
      TESTIMONY TODAY, WANTED TO GIVE US SOME SPECIFIC
      DIRECTION NOW ON SOME OF THOSE ISSUES, I WANTED TO
 7
     LEAVE THAT OPEN AS AN OPTION. REALLY OPTION 2
 8
9
      IS -- WOULD BE TO ACCEPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION,
      WHICH IS ON PAGE 11-3 OF THE ITEM.
10
11
              MEMBER RELIS: I'LL MOVE OPTION 2.
              MEMBER JONES: I'LL SECOND.
12
              CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: WE HAVE A MOTION AND
13
14
     SECOND TO ACCEPT OPTION 2 ON CONSTRUCTION,
   DEMOLITION, AND INERT ISSUE. SECRETARY WILL CALL
15
   THE ROLL ON THAT ONE, PLEASE.
16
              THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER RELIS.
17
              MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
18
              THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER JONES.
19
              MEMBER JONES: AYE.
20
              THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN FRAZEE.
21
              CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: AYE. MOTION IS
22
```

23 CARRIED. AND IS THERE ANY PROBLEM WITH CONSENT ON

24 THAT OR WE NEED TO --

MEMBER JONES: YEAH, CONSENT.

```
CHAIRMAN FRAZEE: OKAY. CONSENT ON THAT.
 1
 OKAY. WE'LL TAKE A LUNCH BREAK AND UNTIL 1:30?
 3 1:30. WE'LL BE IN RECESS.
               (THE LUNCH BREAK WAS THEN TAKEN.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
```